

# *Concordia*

## *Theological Monthly*

---

Vol. XIV

OCTOBER, 1943

No. 10

---

### **The Anselmic View of the Atonement**

The doctrine of the atonement has always been one of the cardinal tenets of the Christian faith—a tenet of such central importance that with it the Christian religion can be said to stand or fall. It was to effect the atonement for man's sin and to reconcile the creature and the Creator that the Son of God assumed the human nature. This has been the conviction of all those who have stood within the historic Christian tradition—from the days of the Apostles onward.

The study of the doctrine of the atonement, accordingly, represents one of the most important chapters in the history of Christian thought. And to this chapter few men have made a more significant or provocative contribution than St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury. It shall be the purpose of this study to analyze and evaluate the Anselmic conception of the Atonement.

#### **Anselm of Canterbury**

Anselm of Canterbury was one of the greatest of the early Scholastics; indeed, he has been called the "father of medieval Scholasticism." In him were combined the qualities requisite for a great religious leader: a deep sense of personal piety, a keen and capacious intellect, a spirit of courage and devotion to principle, and the faculty of winning the love and confidence of those whom he sought to influence and to lead. Born in Aosta in 1033, of noble Germanic stock, he early gave evidence of the deeply religious strain that was to characterize his entire life. At the age of fifteen he had already decided to become a monk; meeting with paternal disapproval, he left home and at length found his way to the monastery of Le Bec, in eastern Normandy, of which the renowned Lanfranc was prior. Anselm followed in the footsteps of his mentor, succeeding him first as abbot of Le Bec, and later, in 1093, as Archbishop of Canterbury.

Anselm's theological orientation was altogether that of traditional Roman Catholic orthodoxy. He never questioned the validity of any of the Church's doctrines; these he held to be true because they had been revealed, and to be accepted without question on the authority of the Church. He conceived of reason as the servant of faith, and his entire theology is characterized by the watchword to which he gives expression in his *Proslogion*: *Credo ut intelligam*. His position is aptly summed up in his treatise *De fide trinitatis*, as quoted by McGiffert: "No Christian ought in any way to dispute the truth of what the Catholic Church believes in its heart and confesses with its mouth. But always holding the same faith unquestioningly, loving it and living by it, he ought himself as far as he is able to seek the reason for it. If he can understand it, let him thank God. If he cannot, let him not raise his head in opposition, but bow in reverence."<sup>1</sup>

At the same time, he was convinced of the rationality of revealed truth, and he felt that this could be proved by taking recourse to dialectics. The disciplines of logic and philosophy were to be pressed into the service of theology, and they should therefore form a part of the professional equipment of every theologian. He was a Platonic realist and held that the reality of universals must be held by the orthodox theologian. It is evident throughout that Anselm's approach to Christianity was predominantly intellectual, and this divests his religious experience of that mysticism which, for example, characterized Bernard of Clairvaux.

Anselm's chief concern was the rational comprehension of the traditional faith, which he essayed to "rethink." He endeavored to reason out the faith which he, for himself, took for granted, both as the body of ecclesiastical teachings and as religious experience. He let the power of reason play upon the affirmation of faith. He felt that such a "reasoning out" of the Christian faith would make it understandable and rationally acceptable even to the Jew and the pagan, without reference to any Scriptural authority. This accounts for the singular paucity of Scriptural references in the writings of Anselm. At the same time his writings were characterized by a deep and fervent piety, as is shown by the fact that he wrote his theological treatises in the form of prayers to God.

### The Writings of Anselm

Never a systematic theologian, Anselm's theological writings consist chiefly of disconnected short essays. Among his most important works are his *Monologion* and his *Proslogion*. In the former he sets forth his cosmological argument for the existence of God—which, it must be acknowledged, is largely based upon his own

1) A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought*, vol. II, p. 186.

a priori doctrinal assumptions. After having given his proofs for God's existence, he goes on to depict His nature, which Anselm conceives as absolute perfection; he concludes with the explication of God's self-expression through the divine Word.

The *Proslogion* is famous for Anselm's ontological proof for the existence of God. "God," he argues, "is that nothing higher than which can be thought; but God would not be that than which nothing higher can be thought if He were only in the understanding." He concludes, therefore: "Without any doubt, therefore, there exists something both in the understanding and in reality than which a greater cannot be conceived." Although Anselm's argument did not find favor among the Schoolmen and was severely criticized in later times by Kant, it must be conceded that it has never been successfully refuted.

It is to his *Cur Deus Homo*, however, that Anselm's chief claim to theological fame is to be ascribed. The doctrine of the atonement had long been subject to an interpretation which Anselm found untenable, and it was to establish what he conceived to be the true reason for God's becoming man that he wrote this, his major theological work. In his *Cur Deus Homo* he broke with longstanding ecclesiastical tradition and adduced a theory of the Atonement which was destined to have an important bearing upon the entire subsequent history of the Christian Church.

#### Patristic Teaching of the Atonement

In order properly to evaluate and understand the Anselmic approach to the Atonement, it will be of some profit briefly to trace the history of this dogma down to the time of Anselm. The immediate successors of the Apostles advanced no "theory" of the Atonement, but confined themselves to the Scriptural statements on the subject — which, to be sure, should be altogether adequate. Nor does any theory of the Atonement loom large in the writings of the Postapostolic Fathers, who laid great stress on the Incarnation in connection with the atoning work of Christ. The method of the Atonement was not a matter of controversy in the postapostolic age. Irenaeus, of course, speaks of Christ's giving His life as a ransom for sinners, and Clement of Alexandria refers to the work of Christ as a propitiation for sin. It remained for Origen, however, to advance the theory that the Atonement was a payment which Christ made to the devil. This theory remained firmly imbedded in Christian thought — even in the case of Augustine — until the time of Anselm.

Among the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Athanasius speaks most clearly and most conformably to Scriptural teaching with regard to the vicarious nature of the Atonement; he declares that Christ died ἀντὶ πάντων ("instead of all"); and that He offered Him-

self as a ransom for all. This emphasis on Christ's payment for the sins of the world was repeated also by Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria. It was to these Fathers that Anselm was most indebted in the theory of the Atonement which he evolved.

A degrading conception of the Atonement was the idea that Jesus had engaged in a game of deception with the devil, who was not permitted to see the Savior's true nature; as a consequence, Jesus allowed Himself to be brought to His passion and death in order then to "fool" the devil by His resurrection and final victory. This appalling and blasphemous distortion of God's plan for the world's redemption through the sacrifice of His Son first suggested, as we intimated before, by Origen, strangely enough gained wide currency; it was held, at least in some measure, by many of the Fathers.

The Latin Fathers held to the centrality of the person and work of Christ, which they were content to describe according to the plain words of Scripture, without attempting any involved theory of the Atonement. Tertullian was the first to employ the term *satisfactio*, although he referred this term to human penances rather than to the atoning work of Christ. The conception of the Atonement as satisfaction does, however, appear in the writings of such Western Fathers as Ambrose, Hilary, Sulpitius Severus, and Lactantius.

Augustine likewise had formulated no elaborate theory of the Atonement, and the aspect of satisfaction does not come to the fore in his interpretation of the work of Christ. He rather viewed the atonement in terms of the penalty which Christ thereby paid for the sins of men, and, in keeping with the prevalent theological mood, he conceived of this payment as being made to the devil. At the same time it must be borne in mind that Augustine laid the groundwork for a clearer apprehension of the work of Christ by his emphasis on sin and grace. Hence, the influence of Augustine in shaping the theology of Anselm was not inconsiderable.

In summarizing the Patristic teaching on the Atonement, then, it must be asserted that the Fathers were not greatly concerned about any philosophy of the Atonement. They accepted it as a fact and did not worry too much about the method or process, which they did not regard as vital. They attempted no scientific construction, no rationalization of this dogma. They did not regard this as essential to the Christian faith. What is evident, however, is their emphasis on the incarnation and its relation to the Atonement. Harnack sums up the Patristic position in these words: "From the days of Paul, all of them [the Fathers] testified that *Christ died for us* and delivered us from the power of the devil. That was felt and proclaimed as the great act of redemption. Ambrose and Augustine had then emphasized the position that Christ is Mediator



as man and had given many instructions about particular points; but the question why that Man, who was at the same time God, was obliged to suffer and die, was dealt with by pointing to His example, or by reciting Biblical texts about ransom, sacrifice, and suchlike, without the necessity of the death here coming clearly to view."<sup>2)</sup>

### *Cur Deus Homo*

It remained for Anselm to formulate a *rationale* of the Atonement and to advance an interpretation of the death of Christ in substitution for one which—despite the centuries of tradition that lay behind it—he regarded as unacceptable. In place of the prevalent idea that the death of Christ was a ransom paid to the devil, he set forth the proposition that this was rather to be regarded as a satisfaction, or reparation, demanded by God's *honor*. This he essayed to prove on the basis of reason and in the form of a philosophical approach. This conception of the atonement, then, he explicated in his epochal treatise *Cur Deus Homo*—which opened up a new area in the domain of Christian theology, and which gave rise to the most important theological discussion since the time of Augustine.

The *Cur Deus Homo* is a formal and logical explanation of the atoning work of Christ; the treatment throughout is based on reason, with the consequence that but little reference is made to Scripture in support of Anselm's position. He wanted to show that both the birth and death of Christ, God's Son, were necessary and "grounded in the very nature of things." Anselm's purpose was, of course, to accomplish a rational understanding of that which he had already comprehended by faith.

The treatise is written in the form of a dialog between Anselm and his rather acquiescent friend Boso, who plays the part of *advocatus diaboli* in the development of the argument. *Cur Deus Homo* is divided into two books: in the first, Anselm replies to objections and proves that man could not have been saved without Christ; in the second he shows that man could be saved only through the God-man.

Anselm begins by showing why none other than God could have liberated man and demonstrates the fallacy of the popular arguments and objections concerning the sacrifice of Christ which Boso adduces. He then proceeds, in Book I, chap. II, to launch into the main body of his argument. The *honor* of God, he maintains, must be kept inviolate. Sin, however, deprives God of His honor and therefore constitutes a debt. By sinning, man frustrates the will and purpose of the Creator. Thus man becomes *guilty* before God.

---

2) A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. XI, p. 56.

God's justice demands that either the guilty be punished or that God be repaid for the loss which He has sustained.<sup>3)</sup>

Now, the honor of God cannot be restored by the obedience of man, however perfect, for man owes God this obedience in any event; what is more, such obedience could never atone for past sins.<sup>4)</sup> Hence, there remain only two possibilities for the reparation of God's honor: either a) punishment of the offender; or b) satisfaction, by which God would receive back *more* than He had lost. In His love, God does not demand nor desire punishment; indeed this would cause God to undo His own work. Therefore, God will accept satisfaction for the reparation of His honor.<sup>5)</sup>

This satisfaction, however, must be quantitatively sufficient to compensate for the sin which deprived God of His honor. Man of himself, however, cannot provide such compensation for his own sin and is therefore unable to render the satisfaction that God requires.<sup>6)</sup> At the same time it is a matter of inexorable justice that the debt be fully repaid.<sup>7)</sup> What is more, even though man of and by himself cannot possibly repay this spiritual debt, he is none the less responsible for it. Hence, there are only three possibilities open: either man cannot be saved at all; or he must be saved by some means other than those taught by Christianity; or he must be saved by Christ, God's Son.<sup>8)</sup> Anselm rules out the first two, and sets out to prove the validity of the third.<sup>9)</sup>

The theme of Book II, therefore, is to show the manner of our salvation through Christ. He undertakes to prove his thesis in syllogistic fashion: Man must render satisfaction, but cannot. Only man *ought* to render satisfaction. But only God *can* render satisfaction. Therefore in order to actualize this satisfaction, God became man in the person of Jesus Christ.<sup>10)</sup>

The next question that logically arises is: How is Christ the God-man? Anselm answers this question by showing that this does not imply the change of the divine nature into the human; nor does it signify the blending of the two natures into a different substance; but it does mean that the divine and the human nature coexist in the person of Jesus Christ, each retaining its own character while partaking of the attributes of the other.<sup>11)</sup>

As the God-man, Christ alone could render satisfaction for man's sin to a degree commensurate with the requirements of God's honor. He could effect this satisfaction, however, only by offering to God something that He did not owe Him and that God could not

3) *Cur Deus Homo*, I: 11, 12.

4) *Ibid.*, 2.

5) *Ibid.*, 14.

6) *Ibid.*, 20.

7) *Ibid.*, 23.

8) *Ibid.*, 24.

9) *Ibid.*, 25.

10) *Cur Deus Homo*, II: 6.

11) *Ibid.*, 7, 8.

demand as His right. Complete obedience on the part of Christ would not have been sufficient, since God demands such obedience as His due. His perfect life, accordingly, would not have constituted a sufficient reparation of God's honor. It was therefore necessary that Christ do that which He was not compelled to do and which was beyond the proper demands of God. Therefore He died. "In order that His sacrifice of Himself might be efficacious, it was necessary that He be not only sinless, and hence under no obligation to die, but also omnipotent and hence able not to die."<sup>12)</sup> He died, not by compulsion, but voluntarily.<sup>13)</sup> He was able, by virtue of the superabundant merits of His death, to atone for the sins of all the world and to render full reparation for the wounded honor of God.<sup>14)</sup>

It is to be kept in mind that Anselm did not hold that Christ was punished for the sins of men, but only that He rendered satisfaction for them. This satisfaction made punishment unnecessary. This view, it will readily be noted, bears a close affinity to the Roman Catholic doctrine of penance, which viewed satisfaction as a prerequisite to pardon. It was Anselm's function to apply the principles of this traditional doctrine in a systematic manner to the work of Christ, in accordance with the thesis that "every sin must be followed either by satisfaction or punishment." Foley holds that Anselm was historically "the one to make the principles of the practice of penance the fundamental scheme of religion in general."<sup>15)</sup>

This consideration also serves to invalidate the theory, of which Shailer Mathews is the chief advocate, that Anselm's conception of the Atonement was derived from his feudal environment. Mathews holds the Anselmic theory of the Atonement to be a classic example of the impact of the social pattern upon theology. This interpretation, however, is utterly without foundation. The emphasis on the honor of God obviously did not originate with Anselm, but appears prominently already in the writings of Tertullian. We concur in McGiffert's conclusion that "Anselm's theory is an example less of the influence of contemporary conditions than of the application of logic to traditional beliefs and customs. The *Cur Deus Homo* is thus of a piece with the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion* and like them is an illustration of Anselm's general theological method."<sup>16)</sup>

12) McGiffert, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

13) *Cur Deus Homo*, II: 10, 11, 17.

14) *Cur Deus Homo*, II: 14, 18b.

15) G. C. Foley, *Anselm's Theory of the Atonement*, p. 109.

16) McGiffert, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

### Evaluation of the *Cur Deus Homo*

In evaluating the *Cur Deus Homo* due recognition must be given to those factors which appear on the credit side of the ledger. It is commendable that Anselm dealt with the Atonement as redemption from *guilt* before God and that he jettisoned the idea of the literal payment of ransom to the devil, maintaining, of course, the truth that Christ redeemed men from the *power* of the devil.

It is to his credit, moreover, that he centered the grace of God in the redeeming work of Christ and set forth the centrality of this doctrine in the divine economy. Anselm stressed the *objective* efficacy of the Atonement. The sacrifice of Christ was valid and effectual even before its appropriation—through faith—by its beneficiaries.

Foley's comment in this connection is significant and aptly summarizes what may be considered the chief and abiding contribution of the *Cur Deus Homo* to the cause of constructive religion: "The very limitation of the inquiry (*Cur Deus Homo?*) turned men's thoughts away from the externalism and superstition of a mere ecclesiastical system to the significance of the person and work of Christ. The discussion has not one word to say of personal and legal satisfactions, of priestly interpositions, of the Church's control of the means of salvation. It fixes attention upon the redemptive meaning of the Incarnation, upon the perfect offering of an obedient life, upon a death whose loving acquiescence and completeness of sacrificial surrender absolutely satisfied a Father's desire for an ideal Son, and it makes these the all-sufficient source and explanation of our reconciliation with God. That is to say, it acknowledges the greatness and sufficiency of Christ's work; forgiveness . . . is the free gift of divine grace and is undeserved and wholly dissociated from human merit."<sup>17</sup>

The Anselmic theory, however, is open to serious objection on a number of counts. For one thing, it does not portray the *vicarious* nature of Christ's work in the strict sense of the term. According to Anselm, Christ did not suffer punishment in our stead, but rather provided a benefit—infinately meritorious, to be sure—for us.

A particularly grave defect of the theory is that it views the Atonement totally apart from the testimony of Scripture, without which the Atonement cannot possibly be properly understood. This not only constitutes an intrinsic weakness in the Anselmic argument, but it also served to direct subsequent thought on the Atonement into extra-Scriptural, and even unscriptural, channels. Anselm proceeds on the basis of pure logic, having recourse entirely to reason. His treatment throughout is abstract.

---

17) Foley, *op. cit.*, pp. 141, 142.

Anselm's approach, moreover, is theologically suspect in that it puts the entire relationship between God and man on a merely legal footing and gives it no ethical significance. His argument is based on the old Germanic law, and he therefore conceives of God's dealing with man in terms of a sovereign overlord dealing with his subject rather than as a loving Father caring for His child. In keeping with this conception of God it naturally follows that He treats sin more as "high treason" than as moral corruption.

A further defect of the theory is its exclusive emphasis on the death of Christ, while the rest of His redeeming work almost vanishes from sight. There is no reference to the Scriptural teaching that Christ also fulfilled the Law in man's stead.

A glaring omission in the *Cur Deus Homo* is the fact that scarcely any mention is made of man's appropriation of the gift of salvation, effected through the atoning work of Christ. He makes little reference to faith as the means by which man receives the benefits of the Atonement. In fact, he virtually loses sight of man as the beneficiary of the redemptive work of Christ. He struck a new — and unscriptural — note in confining the Atonement to the relationship between God and Christ and in disregarding the reconciliation between God and man, which is an integral factor of the Atonement. Anselm is much more concerned about the effect of Christ's redemption upon God than upon man.

Still one more count may be raised against the Anselmic theory, namely, its revival of the trivial notion of Augustine that God wanted to save enough men to replace the fallen angels. This idea is not only totally without Scriptural warrant, but is unworthy of the exalted nature of God and is out of harmony with the universality of His grace.

### Influence of Anselmic Theory

Even though Anselm's theory found but little acceptance among the later Scholastics, it continued to bear a significant influence on the soteriology of the Western Church down through the period of the Reformation. The idea of "satisfaction" appears prominently in the writings of Hugh of St. Victor, Alexander of Hales, and Bonaventura, but none of these accepted the Anselmic theory *in toto*. Among other Schoolmen Anselm's conception of the Atonement was either ignored or openly rejected.

The nearest approach to acceptance of the Anselmic theory is found in the greatest of the Scholastics, Thomas Aquinas, in whose system medieval Roman Catholic theology found its consummation. Inasmuch as Thomistic theology has become authoritative for modern Catholicism, the Anselmic influence has, through the



channels of Thomism, extended down into our own times. As a result, the conception of satisfaction has become fixed in the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Atonement.

---

Anselm's contribution to Christian soteriology in his *opus magnum* — both in itself and in its bearing on subsequent Christian thought — has carved for him a permanent niche in theology's hall of fame. We cannot escape the conclusion, however, that far more important than any rationalization of the Atonement is our own trustful acceptance of this central truth of Christianity as the basis of a sure and eternal hope.

Chicago, Ill.

THOMAS COATES

---

### The Spiritual, Not the Social Gospel in the Church \*

(With Special Reference to the Race Relations Problem)

---

Our country today finds itself confronted with a serious race relations problem. It is only one of the many social and economic questions facing us at this time, but, no doubt, every one who has carefully studied the race problem will admit that it is one of major importance and therefore should not be ignored by those whose business it is to study it. As citizens of our country it vitally concerns us all, and it is in view of this fact that the Missionary Board (upon the writer's suggestion) has decided to take up its study as a part of its agenda, especially since it is the duty of the Board to counsel those who are directly concerned with the problem in its practical applications. It is from this point of view that the Missionary Board, I hope, will continue to give the matter its careful attention.

There is no doubt that many of the thirteen million Negroes in our country are suffering serious injustice and are laboring under decided disadvantages. We shall not go into detail in describing these. They differ in various areas and communities of our country. In some places Negroes practically enjoy every prerogative which their Caucasian neighbors possess; in other places they are denied definite privileges which are theirs as American citizens, while again in other places they are unjustly oppressed and deprived of fundamental Constitutional rights. For this reason we are not merely facing one problem, but a complex of problems with a thousand different aspects and ramifications. Its solution

---

\* An essay read and discussed at the plenary meeting of the Missionary Board of the Synodical Conference, Chicago, Ill., April 28 to 29, 1943.

therefore does not lie in merely adopting this or that measure, but in the removal of the causes in which the problem has its subsistence. As Christian citizens we would suggest that the President of our country appoint a competent central commission to attack the problem together with carefully selected State commissions, consisting of fair and capable Negroes and whites, with a view to remove the causes that have produced and keep alive the problem. Let us, however, add that the problem belongs to a class which admits of no speedy solution and which therefore demands the utmost patience, kindness, and good will on the part of both races.

Fortunately the problem is already being studied and studied soberly, calmly, and justly by Negroes and whites, both in the North and in the South. When the writer took up the race relations question, he was agreeably surprised at the great number of interracial commissions at work on both sides of the Mason and Dixon Line. The work which these commissions have accomplished is, on the whole, of great merit. It reveals an excellent insight into the nature of the problem, suggests at least partial solutions, and creates an atmosphere and environment fatal to the causes of the problem. In this sensible, educational approach to the problem by Negroes and whites, based upon mutual esteem, we may find the ultimate solution of the entire problem, so far as its outward aspects are concerned.

Unfortunately, however, there are extremists to whom this gradual process toward solving the problem seems far too slow and ineffective. They resemble the fanatics in some respects who almost wrecked Luther's Reformation by their rash and inconsiderate handling of certain reforms which the great Reformer in his conservative judgment thought wise to inaugurate only after patient instruction and thorough indoctrination. Mr. J. Saunders Redding (a Negro writer) in his recent book *A Negro Surveys His People and Tells of Their Problems* (Harper and Bros.) points out a very important factor in the solution of the race relations problem when he writes: "To know and understand and love the Negro is not enough. One must understand and know and love the white man as well." Mr. Redding here suggests mutual love as a basis for the solution of the race problem. But that is a far cry from the hatred and bitterness which fanatics are preaching in papers, books, and magazines, and which in the end will only harm the good cause of bringing about better relations between the two races. Against such dangerous agitation in the Negro press to inflame race prejudice, a prominent and fair-minded Negro, Dr. Warren Brown, Director of Race Relations, has published in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, Dec. 19, 1942 (quoted in the *Reader's Digest*, Jan., 1943), an earnest warning showing at the same time

how unjust and injurious are the disruptive efforts of sensation-mongering Negroes. Such extremists are found, of course, also among the Whites, and it is largely this injudicious handling of the problem that keeps the fires of race hatred burning in our country. There are still other and perhaps more serious aspects to the problem, accentuated by present-day war conditions, but lack of time prevents us from going into detail on this point.

### **The Race Problem Made a Church Problem**

What makes the race problem directly one of consideration for the Missionary Board is the fact that it has been injected into the Church as a fundamental and necessary business which the Church by all means must attend to. The Federal Council of Churches, having rejected as such the spiritual Gospel of the crucified and risen Christ, has long championed the so-called "social gospel," and as a part of this also the solution of the race problem, for which Dr. E. Stanley Jones has suggested a definite, though incomplete, program. We are not directly concerned here with what the Federal Council of Churches intends to do on this score; only since it has officially taken up the race problem, the impression is being spread that the matter is one belonging properly to the jurisdiction of the Christian Church and that the Church neglects a part of its given duty if it does not concern itself vitally and actively with this and other social problems. The "social gospel" in various forms is insinuating itself also into many hitherto orthodox churches. It is a constant and real threat, since it is the doctrine of this-worldliness, aiming chiefly at the achievement of temporal well-being through right living. It entirely obliterates the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins and otherworldliness. This so-called "gospel" broadly covers all endeavors of unbelieving churches and church leaders to right the social, economic, and political wrongs from which human society is suffering. It converts the spiritual task of the Church into an earthly one. It directs men away from God and heaven, and causes them to be concerned with this earth and its problems. The great necessity of sounding a warning against such a "perverted gospel" has led to the writing of this essay, in which we shall consider in the main two propositions:

I. It is the business of the Christian Church to proclaim to mankind perishing in sin the spiritual Gospel of the crucified and risen Christ, and not the so-called "social gospel."

II. However, by preaching the spiritual Gospel of Christ it will, under God, and so far as God blesses its mission, also effect a solution of many of the social and economic problems which are confronting us because of man's utter sinfulness and perverseness.

## I

That it is the business of the Church to preach the spiritual Gospel of Christ really requires no lengthy proof for believing Christians. They know that when Christ sent out His Apostles, He commanded them to "preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15) and to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:19, 20).

There can be no doubt about the nature of the Gospel which the Apostles were to preach to every creature. Christ Himself proclaimed that Gospel very clearly and definitely when He performed His prophetic ministry on earth, as the four holy Evangelists attest. *Directly* Christ testified that His mission consisted in seeking and saving that which was lost (Luke 19:10); and the truth of this He proved in His entire pastoral ministry when He dealt with such sinners as humble Zacchaeus, penitent Mary, the believing Centurion, repentant Peter, and hosts of others. *Indirectly* Christ showed that it was His divinely appointed mission to preach the spiritual Gospel by refusing to deal in cases where external or earthly matters came into consideration. He, for example, did not command the Centurion to free his servant (slave), but respected the established relation of master and servant (Matt. 8:9). He did not preach disobedience to, and rebellion against, the Roman oppressors, but very earnestly commanded the Jews: "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things which are God's" (Matt. 22:21). He did not side with the Pharisees against the woman who was taken in adultery, since the stoning on which her enemies insisted was a matter of political law (John 8:5, 6). In short, Christ never in His divine ministry mingled earthly and spiritual affairs, never preached a "social gospel," but always the spiritual Gospel of salvation by His vicarious death (Matt. 20:28). His theology and ministry were otherworldly, not this-worldly. Also His miracles were to serve this preaching of the spiritual Gospel. They were not an end in themselves, but a means to an end (John 5:36; 10:25). In the same manner the holy Apostles after Pentecost always preached the spiritual Gospel and never made themselves proponents of a "social gospel." St. Paul in his ministry testified "the Gospel of the grace of God" (Acts 20:24). To him, he says, was given "the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:18). To the Corinthians he writes: "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him Crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). The spiritual Gospel was always consistently proclaimed by him, as his many epistles testify, and never a "social gospel."

And as St. Paul, so also did his fellow Apostles. Their epistles are full of spiritual Gospel, but never at any time do they preach a "social gospel." True, they insist on sanctification, or on good works done by believers. But they address their admonition regarding sanctification only to Christians. St. Paul thus writes: "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth" (1 Cor. 5:12, 13). When St. Paul met and through the Gospel converted the runaway slave Onesimus, he sent him back to his master Philemon as a slave, though also as a believer freed in the Lord, that is, liberated spiritually. To this the objection may be raised that St. Peter once refused to preach the Gospel to Cornelius and was then commanded by God to break down all social distinctions and to preach the Gospel to him in spite of his social prejudices (Acts 10:1 ff.). But in this case no social problems were involved. St. Peter simply labored under the old Pharisaic prejudice that salvation was only for the Jews and not also for the Gentiles (Acts 10:28). In short, there is no shred of proof whatever to show that the Christian Church should preach the "social gospel," but with one accord the whole Bible testifies that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke 24:47). That is Christ's own direction to His Apostles and ministers as to what kind of Gospel they are to preach, and His command is final. From His divine verdict there is no appeal. Our divine Lord in His whole Word insists that we should preach to a dying, perishing world, which He has purchased with His own blood, the spiritual Gospel of Christ, and not a "social gospel," no matter in what form it may appear.

#### Why This Insistence?

There are two reasons, in the main, why Christian ministers, by the will and command of God, should proclaim to the world the spiritual Gospel of Christ and not meddle in any so-called "social gospel."

The first is that the lost and perishing world desperately needs the message of sin and grace, of repentance and remission of sins. Without the preaching of Law and Gospel not a single sinner can be saved from the eternal damnation of hell and be brought into the everlasting glory of heaven. And there is no preaching of the Gospel outside the Christian Church. Unbelieving, pagan, worldly preachers may preach, to a certain extent, matters pertaining to the Law. But they cannot preach even the Law properly. They cannot preach the utter damnable-ness of sin, since hereditary corruption has blinded their minds and has obscured the divine Law written in man's heart at creation. Nor would they want to preach



the *Gospel* in their unbelieving state, even if they heard about it, for to them the crucified Christ is either a stumbling block or foolishness (1 Cor. 1:23). So the believing Christian Church must preach the message of salvation in order that God's elect may be brought into Christ's fold; and it must preach the Gospel all the more earnestly today since we are living in the last evil times of the world, when the great apostasy from the Gospel has already taken place and large church groups, such as the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, advocate and defend perversions of the old Bible truths. If we do not preach the Gospel of salvation through faith in Christ, we shall be condemned both as individuals and as a Church. The letters in the Book of Revelation to the various churches in Asia Minor indeed reveal to us the great need of our spiritual mission as Christ's messengers of His Word and the exceeding wrath of God upon us if we fail in our mission.

This preaching of the spiritual Gospel of Christ does not mean that the Church should not insist upon sanctification, upon good works, upon the exercise of love and kindness, upon the sanctifying of the social ties and conditions which by God's will and order exist in the world. But sanctification must always be preached by Christian ministers as a fruit of regeneration, never apart from the saving Gospel of Christ. Good works which do not flow from faith in Christ have no spiritual value whatsoever in the sight of God, but are of value only in the field of civil righteousness, and this value is very limited indeed.

The other reason why the Christian Church must earnestly preach the spiritual Gospel of Christ is that even the heart of the Christian, inasmuch as he still is burdened with the old Adam, desires not spiritual, but earthly blessings. The falling away of the congregation in Galatia from the Gospel of Christ may serve us as a terrible warning. Perverted man loves both the doctrine of work-righteousness and the pleasures of this world. And, as St. Paul warns us, in the last days perilous times shall come, when men shall be lovers of their own selves, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God (2 Tim. 2:1 ff.). Together with work-righteousness and love for this world and its pleasures and treasures there is found in the corrupt human heart also the vice of ingratitude, which the Old Testament for our warning illustrates in scores of cases, which amaze us especially as we view it in the ingrates to whom Christ has ministered in His supreme love and which the holy Apostles reprove and condemn in many different passages. This vice of worldliness and ingratitude St. Paul rebuked in the Corinthians, commanding them: "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it. But if thou mayest be made free, use it rather.

For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman. Likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant" (1 Cor. 7:20-22). What these words teach is that Christians should first seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness (Matt. 6:33) and then humbly serve God in the station in which He has called them. After all, earthly things do not matter; it is the spiritual and eternal things that matter: "for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal" (1 Cor. 4:18). When Christians wickedly seek the things of this world rather than those of heaven, forgetting the grace which has called them to salvation, they sin against their divine Lord and imperil their souls. It is, of course, not wrong for a Christian to improve his condition in life, if God so leads and blesses him; but this is quite a different matter from making an earthly pursuit the uppermost thought in his mind and letting it prompt him to set aside the spiritual Gospel of Christ for the so-called "social gospel." There is no doubt that the "social gospel" is a snare of the devil by which he means to deprive us of the spiritual Gospel and so ultimately of our eternal salvation.

## II

Our second proposition reads: "By preaching the spiritual Gospel of Christ, the Christian Church will, under God, and so far as God blesses its mission, also effect a solution of many of the social and economic problems facing the world because of man's utter sinfulness and perverseness."

Let us begin our discussion with the last words of our thesis in which we maintain that we are facing our present-day social and economic problems because of man's utter sinfulness and perverseness. To many this may appear as a hard saying. Nevertheless, it is true. There is no evil in the world which does not have its source in the sinfulness and perverseness of the corrupt human heart. Tyranny and oppression thus came from greed and selfishness. There is hatred, strife, and bloodshed among men because of man's hereditary corruption. In short, there are evils in the world only because there is sin in the world.

Christianity realizes this fact and therefore preaches the divine Law as no man-made religion can teach it. Our unchristian champions of the "social gospel" can have no cure for the evils that trouble the world because they do not admit their real cause—sin. After all, the Law which they preach amounts to very little. Most of them are evolutionists and as such they do not even acknowledge sin as sin. But what is still worse, the unbelieving advocates of the "social gospel" have no spiritual Gospel, and only the divine Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every-

one that believeth. The Gospel is the means by which the Holy Spirit engenders faith in the human heart and through faith regeneration and sanctification. And if the Gospel is only given a chance to do its blessed work, it works a million blessings in the world, making it a veritable paradise, such as once existed on certain islands of the New Hebrides group when John Paton brought the Gospel there, or such as was found in large areas when the Apostles preached the redeeming Gospel of Christ to the morally corrupt world of their time. Where else do we find real happiness, love, justice, and other virtues in the world than among Christians, not nominal Christians, but Christians that take their faith seriously? Of the early Roman Christians the heathen used to say: "Behold, how they love each other!" True brotherly love was unknown in pagan Rome. There were no hospitals for the sick and poor in Rome until Christianity founded them. Julian the Apostate, who endeavored to re-paganize the Roman world, used to rebuke his fellow heathen because they neglected their suffering poor, while the despised, hated, persecuted Christians fed and clothed them in time of need. The whole defense system of Christian Apologetics is largely based upon the sanctifying influence of Christianity, and many fine volumes have been written to show in detail the re-creating power of the Christian Gospel. We as orthodox Christians are solving, on our part and in our humble way, the race question best if we adhere to the spiritual Gospel of Jesus Christ and preach to the world in its truth and purity both the Law and the Gospel; in other words, when we are loyal to our divinely entrusted mission.

But why, then, one might ask, are there so many distressing evils in the world today? Why, to be more specific, are we confronted with the evils of a race problem? To these and other questions there is but one answer: simply because the spiritual Gospel is neither generally proclaimed nor generally accepted by men. We are *not* living in a Christian country. Our nation as such is *not* Christian. Not even the visible, external Christian Church of our country is Christian in its profession and practice. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America is largely governed by men who refuse to believe the fundamentals of the Christian faith and even glory in their infidelity. Of course, by the grace of God, there are elect saints in all churches where God's Word is still proclaimed and where the Bible is being read. But when we consider how many antichristian cults exist in our country, how even the Fundamentalist bodies are not fully loyal in their emphasis on the fundamentals of Christianity, but are losing themselves in enthusiastic dreams regarding millennialistic enjoyments awaiting them, and lastly, when we keep in mind that

even Lutheranism in America often fails in rightly promulgating the doctrines of sin and grace, how can we then ask why in the world today there should be so many evils of lovelessness, greed, hate, strife, murder, oppression, and the like? If the world is suffering from so many and great evils, it is because it has rejected Christ's saving, redeeming, sanctifying Gospel.

### The Mission Policy of the Synodical Conference

Over half a century ago, the Synodical Conference, in the fear of God, decided to do missionary work among the Negroes of our country. That work was the fruit of faith, the expression of true love for Christ, and in Christ also for the Negro of our country. It was an attempt, too, at least in part, to right the wrongs which had been done to the Negro in our country by ungodly men who sought only their materialistic gain, not the good of the country, nor the welfare of those whom by force they made their servants. For sixty-six years (our mission work among the Negroes having first been planned in 1877) our Lutheran Christians in the synods constituting the Synodical Conference have liberally contributed toward this great but often hard work. Throughout the South and now in the North, the East, the Middle West, and the extreme West, thousands of Negroes have heard, many of them for the first time, the precious Gospel of Christ in its whole truth and purity. How many elect saints of God from among the Negroes have been gathered into Christ's fold we do not know. But there have been tens of thousands, to be sure, who have had the opportunity to hear God's Word and learn the way of salvation. Unstintingly our Christian people have given of their substance these many years that souls, purchased and redeemed by Christ, might know the path to heaven.

Nor is this all. Our Lutheran Christians have also given generously toward the bodily relief of those who suffered. Just how much of this work of Christian charity has been done is hard to tell, because no one has kept an account of it. But from our own experience, while in the blessed work years ago, we personally can say that no plea of ours for relieving the sick and suffering needy ever fell on deaf ears. We always found open hearts and open pocketbooks — generous, consecrated contributors toward the Lord's holy cause.

And to this blessed work, to which the Synodical Conference has consecrated itself in the fear of God, it will remain loyal, knowing that this is God's will and that by doing this precious work it is conferring upon God's elect both spiritual and eternal blessings; and besides, it is fitting men and women for successful work in this life, since "godliness is profitable unto all things, having

promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come" (1 Tim. 4:8). In short, we shall under God continue our work as we have done it in the past, as our pious fathers have done theirs, as Luther and his co-workers have done theirs, as the Apostles have done theirs, and as Christ, our Lord, has done His.

### The Futility of the Social Gospel

We cannot close this essay without referring at least briefly to the utter futility of the "social gospel." The "social gospel" has failed in the past and is bound to fail in the future. It makes promises, often very great promises, but it cannot fulfill them. And for this failure there is a reason. When the Church enters the field of the "social gospel," it, in the first place, leaves its proper sphere of work and enters that of civil government. To put it dogmatically, it leaves the realm of the *iustitia spiritualis* (spiritual righteousness) to dedicate itself to the *iustitia civilis* (civil righteousness). That is why it is bound to fail. It is attempting an *opus alienum*, a foreign work, for which it is not equipped, unless perhaps it appropriates to itself the sword of the State and thus mingles Church and State, which we in America (I hope) shall never do. Again, those who have championed the "social gospel" in the past (as also those who make it an issue now) have largely been persons who have given up the spiritual Gospel of Christ, which alone has power to change human hearts and to regenerate men. The Church has only one means by which it can do its work, and that is the Word of God. If the Church surrenders that Word, it surrenders its power and remains helpless, powerless, and ineffective, despite all the good intentions it may have. Even if the Church should strive to remain essentially Christian, it will not gain anything by adopting the "social gospel"; for the "social gospel" is bound to crowd out the spiritual Gospel of Christ, and then all is lost. As a Church we have but one function to perform, and that is to preach Christ — the crucified and risen Savior. In that lie both our strength and our victory.

### What is Asked of the Church

It may be objected that we look at the problem before us in too pessimistic a way. Let us see. In an address at the General United Session of the Co-operating Agencies (Federal Council of Churches), Cleveland, Ohio, Dec. 8, 1942, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, International President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, defined the problem of the Negro and set forth a number of things which the Church might do to settle the question. Mr. Randolph's address shows deep insight into the problem as also fine judgment so far as effective measures are concerned to solve the problem. But is the Church really able to do what he suggests? He says:



"The problem of the Negro is a problem of discrimination, segregation, and jim-crow in the economic, political, and social life of America." That is a good description of the problem, and he illustrates it well by fitting references to historic facts.

The problem, as one sees at once, is a tremendously great one, and so the demands upon the Church to solve it must also be great. Mr. Randolph therefore puts the question: "What can the Church do to make the racial relations better, more constructive, and creative?" and then suggests the following:

"1. The White Church could set aside a week in which sermons could be preached and religious meetings held for the specific purpose of impressing the membership with the necessity of translating the principles of Jesus Christ into reality [?] by the employers and workers who are members of the Church observing the President's Executive Order 8802 (regarding fair employment practice, eliminating discrimination on account of color, race, religion, or national origin) and giving Negroes the right to work according to their training and skills and also the opportunity to become members of trade unions.

"2. Print in the church bulletins the Executive Order and a description of the effect of race prejudice on national unity and the production of munitions for the armed forces and how it plays into the hands of the Axis powers.

"3. Demand the abolition of the segregation of Negro blood by the Red Cross, a humanitarian institution, since there is no scientific ground to indicate any differences in the blood plasma.

"4. Demand the abolition of discrimination in the armed forces of all forms.

"5. Call for the abolition in the Government of all discrimination, for the Government sets the cue for discrimination in private industry. The Federal Government has also been the means of carrying throughout the country the pattern of racial discrimination and jim-crow, thereby making the democracy a mockery and a fraud in America.

"6. The Church should cleanse its own temples of the sin of race discrimination, segregation, and jim-crow, and thereby make itself truly a 'House of God' to minister to the souls and spirits of men, not the white man, the yellow man, the brown man, the black man, or the red man, but man.

"7. Form a church committee for the purpose of supporting the Anti-Poll Tax Bill which will be presented in Congress when it reopens [This was spoken before Jan. 1] and fight for the abolition of the white primaries that obtain in eleven Southern States, and thereby help give the Negro people the right to exercise their constitutional suffrage.

"8. Call for membership for the Negro people on the peace commission of the United States which will help to make the peace of the world. The Negro today constitutes the supreme test of American democracy. The President of the United States does not seem to possess the moral courage to challenge certain elements in the benighted sections of the South, and while democracy was being trampled upon in the Senate by Southern demagogues like Senator Bilbo of Mississippi, the President remained silent in the White House. Surely, we have had no case of Nazism and Fascism or totalitarianism anywhere in the world that exceeds this example of demagoguery, intolerance, bigotry, and obscurantism such as obtained in the Senate when democracy was murdered by Southern Bourbonism. Although the South is but one fourth of the population of the United States, it holds fifty per cent of the chairmanships of the United States House of Representatives. They have achieved this under this Democratic administration. Because of a rotten borough system made possible by the poll tax and the white primaries, Southern senators and representatives are able to build up seniority and capture the chairmanships of committees."

Mr. Randolph concludes his address with the words: "If this war does not achieve racial, economic, political, and social equality for the Negro and all of the darker races, it will have been fought in vain and will be only a prelude to a more terrible war between the colored and white races of the world."

But does not perhaps Mr. Randolph demand too much of the churches? Certainly not from the viewpoint of the race problem as he sees it, and, we may add, as also others see it. But how can the Church perform such impossible tasks? And if it would attempt this, where would the spiritual Gospel of Christ remain? Should the precious truth of salvation be shelved?

The race problem is one which must concern us as citizens of our country seeking "the welfare of the city." But as a Church of Christ, true to His Word, we have a task to perform which is far greater and far more important than anything earthly can be. As a Church of Christ we shall preach kindness and charity and the relief of suffering in the spirit of helpful love. But, above all, we shall continue to preach the Gospel of the risen, triumphant Christ, the only Savior of the world, and through this preaching of the Gospel of grace we shall confer on men inestimable blessings for this life and the life to come. To Timothy, St. Paul writes, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom: Preach the Word" (2 Tim. 4:1, 2). And that is the sacred duty of the Christian Church also today: "PREACH THE WORD."

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

## Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference)

### Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity

2 Kings 5:8-19

"The heavens declare the glory of God." Ps. 19:1. Man can learn from nature that there is a Supreme Being, omnipotent, eternal, glorious, Rom. 1:19, 20. However, really to know God and to trust in Him is not within the range of man's natural powers. It is rather, as we see also in the case of Naaman, the Syrian, a divine gift bestowed by means of the Word of God.

#### Naaman's Conversion to the God of Israel

1. *How It Was Brought About*      2. *How It Became Evident*

#### 1

Naaman was a man of high rank and authority. V. 1. Not often do we find such among the believers. 1 Cor. 1:26. How did it come about? All his worldly glory notwithstanding, he was a leper. But his wife had a maid of Israel waiting on her. V. 2. The little maid recommended the prophet in Samaria. V. 3. Acting on this recommendation and equipped with a letter of his king Benhadad to Joram, king of Israel, Naaman called on the latter.

The reaction of Joram to Benhadad's letter was unfavorable and very discouraging. V. 7. Hope had all but died out of the leper's heart, and he was about to abandon his quest when a message of divinely inspired, supreme confidence arrived from the prophet. V. 8. Obeying the summons, Naaman stood at the door of the house of Elisha. However, he did not so much as come out to meet the great man, who was to realize that his princely splendor and riches did not give him a claim on God's favor. But he sent him the command and promise of v. 10. Strange to say Naaman did not welcome this good word. Vv. 11, 12. He had very definite ideas of his own as to how the cure was to be effected. And since the prophet's prescription was not in line with these, he turned and went away in a rage. But God was longsuffering and patient with him. The sensible remonstrance of his servants was the means by which the general was brought to his senses.

He now sees his folly. Instead of following his physician's instructions, he had tried to do the prescribing. Though doubts may still have assailed him, yet faith kept the upper hand and won the day. As he dipped himself in Jordan the seventh time, "his flesh came again as the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." Not

only physical health he recovered but also health of soul. He had found his God.

Like Naaman we, too, are indebted to God for our faith. The same blindness and opposition to God's Word that we note in Naaman afflicted and actuated us. We were just as sinful and guilty, just as unreceptive to the Gospel. But according to His mercy he saved us. Titus 3:4-7; Eph. 5:25-27; 1 John 5:20. Such grace was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began. 2 Tim. 1:9.

2

That Naaman had indeed become clean, also morally, his attitude and conduct make evident. V. 15 a; Luke 17:15. With a heart aglow with love and gratitude to the God of Israel, he urges upon the Lord's prophet a princely gift. V. 15; cp. v. 5 b. In this case, however, the prophet declines. He wants the truth to stand out clear and unclouded that it was the Lord's doing. Without resenting the refusal Naaman asks for another favor. V. 18. Of this soil he wants to build an altar as a memorial to the divine benefaction. Ps. 103:1-3. On this he intends to offer burnt offerings and sacrifices only to the Lord. He has a tender conscience. V. 18. It is a great relief to him that he may enter the house of Rimmon in the performance of his duty as the king's adjutant.

If our heart has been purified by faith, it will appear in our disposition and life. We shall be glad to support the ministry with our contributions. 1 Cor. 9:11, 14; Gal. 6:6. To worship God publicly and privately will not be onerous, but a sweet and blessed privilege, and we shall sacrifice to God the thankofferings of our lips and of willing obedience. There can be with believers no flouting of God's will, no moral laxity. They will conscientiously seek to ascertain and do the will of God and will not be found in unsavory places of temptation and sin unless duty demands their presence there.

Have we a faith that works? Let us wash and be clean by faith in the remission of sins conveyed and sealed to us in our baptism. So shall we know God and serve Him.

PAUL G. BIRKMANN

### Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity

1 Sam. 15:13-26

This narrative is one of those of which Paul declares: 1 Cor. 10:11. Through attentive consideration of this text the Holy Spirit wishes to save us from grievous sin, from shameful folly, from despair, and eternal ruin. Therefore, praying for His blessing, we shall now prayerfully consider that which our text presents to us:

**The Ruinous Sin of Saul, the King of Israel**

## 1

This sin began in *shameful ingratitude*.

a) God had bestowed upon Saul most precious blessings. Samuel refers to this v. 17.

By birth Saul was a member of God's chosen people. Reared in the true religion. His father was a wealthy, prominent man. God had also given to Saul not only a healthy body but also an impressive and commanding presence, 1 Sam. 9:1, 2. God gave to Saul a very faithful, wise, godly pastor, Samuel. God also anointed him to be a king of the people of Israel, v. 17. God bestowed upon him repeated deliverances and successes, which brought great glory to Saul's house. Moreover, God had given him a son of genuine piety, valor, intelligence, and unselfishness, a son of whom any father could be proud, Jonathan. God gave him a son-in-law who was a very prince among men, David. Through this son-in-law God brought repeated deliverances to Saul and all Israel. Tell me, could we not say to Saul: What more could the Lord have done for you?

b) And now notice the shameful ingratitude of Saul. Instead of thanking God, he gave way to gloomy discontent. He became filled with base ingratitude to God and to man. Instead of rejoicing because of God's gifts, he was filled with jealousy, anger, and ill will towards David, and in part also towards his own son Jonathan. These sins so possessed him that he wished to kill both David and Jonathan. He despised Samuel's admonition; he despised the Word and commandment of God. Text, vv. 13-16. What shameful ingratitude!

Who is not appalled at this man's sin? But "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." We also are tempted to ingratitude, jealousy, envy, discontent. We forget to heed: "Forget not all His benefits." "Count your many blessings." God preserve us from Saul's shameful sin! God give us gratitude and appreciation of His great blessings, till we sing with the Psalmist, Ps. 116:12-14. Hymn 34, stanza 1; or Hymn 33, stanza 2.

## 2

Now notice what it was that took the place of gratitude which should have been in this man's heart, *pride and self-righteousness*.

a) Far from being ashamed of this his sin of ingratitude, Saul proudly and foolishly entertained the highest opinion of his own wisdom and ability. This led him repeatedly to prefer his own plan, his own thoughts, to the plain, clear commands of the Lord. He thought that he was above humble obedience to God. Thus, instead of doing what God had commanded him: to destroy the Amalekites and to fight against them until they be consumed, he



preferred to save their king, Agag, in order to bring him home in triumph. Instead of destroying the sheep and the oxen, v. 9, he thought of preserving the best of these "in order to sacrifice them to the Lord." In Saul's opinion the commands of God were foolish but Saul's schemes and plans were wise. Instead of humility and fear of God pride and self-righteousness filled his heart.

b) We see this same sin in Absalom, Ahithophel, and Judas. That is a very common and most ruinous sin. All unbelievers become guilty of it. Indeed, this sin also tempts us. God has warned us: 1 Pet. 5:6. Text, v. 22. It is God's intention to elevate us; but even as it was necessary for Jesus to be humiliated, crucified, to die, and be buried in order to receive a name above every name, so it is necessary for us first to suffer, to bear the cross, so that God may exalt us *in due time*. Our flesh and blood rebels against that, even as Peter did not wish to hear Jesus speak about suffering and humiliation, Matt. 16:22.

Through this sin of contempt for God's mercy and of self-exultation, the exaltation of human reason, men become fools, Rom. 1:22. The ways of God are above our ways, they often seem wrong or foolish to us; but: 1 Cor. 1:25; Prov. 1:7.

What was the consequence of this sin of Saul? V. 26. Saul's despair and death, involving his whole family in ruin. Should not this warning example cause us to examine ourselves, to repent of our foolish pride, and to pray earnestly to be cleansed by the blood of Christ? Should we not plead with God to guide us and impress the words of the text upon us: "To obey is better than sacrifice"? This same truth is also impressed upon us in Prov. 3:5-7. Hymn 366, stanzas 5 and 7.

M. SOMMER

### **Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity**

Ezek. 3:17-21

In the congregation at Corinth many Christians did not properly evaluate their pastors. 1 Cor. 1:11 ff.; chaps. 3, 4. That is a fault found in many congregations to this day. Therefore the text is very timely.

#### **God's Evaluation of the Pastor**

*As to his person; his office; his duty; his responsibility*

#### **1**

"Son of man." This term, applied so frequently to Ezekiel, was to keep him humble; he was to remember, and all who heard him were to keep in mind, that he was a son of man, born of sinful parents, himself a sinful, mortal being. When God so determined, He sent angels as His messengers. But He does not call angels into the pastoral office, nor does He create perfect human beings for this office. He is satisfied with imperfect, sinful men,

1 Cor. 4:7, as long as they are Christians, like Paul striving for perfection, Phil. 3:8-14. Christian congregations should not forget this simple fact, not expect the impossible, a perfect pastor, free from all faults, who never makes mistakes. 1 Cor. 4:4, 5. As long as God is satisfied, the congregation must be satisfied with a son of man as their pastor.

## 2

Though a sinner like all men, a Christian pastor has a very exalted office. He is like Ezekiel appointed by the Lord to be a watchman over the house of God. Ezekiel was called directly, Ezekiel, chaps. 1-3, as was Paul, Acts 9:1-6. But Paul calls not only himself a minister of Christ, etc., 1 Cor. 4:1, but includes in this term men like Apollos and other pastors, 1 Cor. 4:6; Acts 20:28, who were called by the Christian congregations to whom God had given the office of the keys, Matt. 18:18, and whom God wants to call pastors, overseers, watchmen, Titus 1:5; Acts 13:1-4; 14:23. While the pastor is the minister of the congregation, he is also a minister of Christ, 1 Cor. 4:1. While not lords, autocrats, 1 Pet. 5:3, yet they are overseers, Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:2, to be honored and esteemed as such, 1 Thess. 4:8; 5:12, 13; 1 Tim. 5:17; Heb. 13:7, 17; Luke 10:16; John 13:20; 1 Cor. 9:7-14.

## 3

V. 17 b. The prophet received his message directly from God, Ezek. 2:9 to 3:12. His duty was to preach this word exactly as it had been given to him. The pastor is given his message in the Bible, God's revelation. His duty is stated explicitly, Deut. 4:2; 12:32; Prov. 30:6. God wants him to preach the Gospel though it is foolishness to man, 1 Cor. 1:18, 23; and to proclaim the Law, though that is hateful to man, Ezek. 2:3-8; Jer. 15:10; 20:8. In season and out of season, the command is Matt. 28:20; as Paul did, Acts 20:26, 27, 31; as Peter and John did, Acts 4:19, 20; 2 Pet. 1:12 f.; 1 John 1:1-3. Law and Gospel are to be applied publicly and privately to the Christian in his life at home, in business, as a church member, as a civic officer, in joy and sorrow, in health, in sickness, on his dying bed, Phil. 3:1. That is what God demands, and that, no more and no less, the congregation must demand. Not popularity, not silver-tongued oratory, not flattery, not respecting of persons, but faithfulness in bringing God's message, God's Law and God's Gospel, to the hearts and homes of his parishioners, that alone constitutes the pastor a faithful watchman, 1 Cor. 4:1-5.

## 4

This faithfulness involves a terrible responsibility, vv. 18-20. God does not demand that the pastor save every soul entrusted to his care. If any one of his parishioners sins, rejects the Law

or despises the Gospel, that parishioner will be held responsible, whether the pastor had warned him or not. But if a pastor prefers to remain on the good side of a wicked or apostatizing parishioner and therefore fails in his God-appointed duty, he forfeits his own salvation. The pastor's own soul is the price he must pay for refusing to warn those entrusted to his care. Let that be a warning to every pastor. And certainly no parishioner should demand so tremendous a sacrifice merely because he does not like to have his conscience aroused by a faithful pastor.

Conclusion: Paul asks the Christians to pray for him, 1 Thess. 5:25; 2 Thess. 3:1. So pray for your pastor that both he and the congregation may remain aware of the imperfection of his person, of the high dignity of his office, of his exalted duty, and of the responsibility resting on his soul.

TH. LAETSCH

### Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity

Ps. 37:25-40

A comparison between a Christian and the wicked presents a serious problem. Therefore the admonition in v. 1, "Fret not thyself," etc. Ps. 73 describes the perplexity of a believer when he contemplates the prosperity of the wicked. It also points out the solution of this problem. Nevertheless the earthly prosperity of the wicked startles many a Christian and troubles him with thoughts of doubt. He knows, of course, that God's ways are not his ways, yet this alone does not seem to be sufficient for him to regain his spiritual balance. Therefore the Bible offers much instruction on this point. So here also.

#### The Christian Compared with the Wicked

1. *In regard to his life*
2. *In regard to his end*

#### 1

The life of a Christian is rooted in, and stems from, the Word of God, v. 31. By the Word of God (the Gospel, of course) he is born again, he, then, knows himself to be God's child. His heart is filled with gratitude for the infinite love and mercy of his Savior. This Word of God is a living, life-giving power in his heart. Having accepted Christ as his Savior, he has forgiveness of sins, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to him, he is called "righteous," vv. 29, 30, perfect, v. 37.

So he leads a life of grateful obedience to his Father in heaven. According to the spirit he delights to do His will. God's mercy to him is reflected in that the Christian is merciful to others, v. 26. God's holiness in that he shuns the evil, v. 27. In times of trouble

he waits on the Lord, vv. 34, 39. Knowing the love of God in Christ Jesus, he is confident that God's will is always right. He patiently bears his cross, v. 28. He is certain that God will not forsake him. He goes through this life as a witness for Christ, for the eternal truth, v. 30.

The life of the wicked is not rooted in the Word of God. He ignores, rejects, the holy councils of God. His life stems from, and is ruled by, pride, v. 35, selfishness, self-righteousness. In order to attain his ends he disregards God's precepts altogether, lives in persistent revolt, v. 38. He despises those who accept the Gospel, even hates them, v. 32. By thus revealing his enmity against Christ and His followers he proves himself to be a slave to sin and nothing but a willing tool of the devil, the arch-enemy of God and of all that is good.

Therefore the entire life of the wicked, all his doings, be they good (humanly speaking) or bad, all his accomplishments, successes, triumphs, are under a curse; while the life of a Christian with its joys and sorrows, its failings and successes, is under the blessing of God.

## 2

Vv. 35, 36. Here the end of the wicked is described. There was one in great power. Perhaps he had amassed huge wealth, attained a leading position among his fellow men; like a green bay tree he stood, proud and boastful; had many followers who fawned upon him. He gloated in his power and wealth.

But v. 36. He could not ward off death. And with death his house of cards collapsed. Soon he was forgotten. His former friends "worshiped" at other "shrines." But temporal death is not the real end, v. 38. The wicked having rejected God's merciful plan of salvation will be banished forever from the face of God and suffer eternal punishment in hell. What a "reward" for a few years of carnal joy!

And now the end of a Christian. His trust in God's gracious promises, vv. 25, 28, 33, 34, his diligence in obeying God, v. 26, his efforts to shun the evil, v. 27, his patient cross-bearing, v. 39, his faithfulness, v. 30, shall not be in vain. Yes, he may have endured the sting of the mockers' tongue and suffered from his persecutions, v. 32. He may have been denied the riches of this earth, v. 25, the earth may have been a vale of tears to him. But, and this is all-important, his end is a salvation, a deliverance, vv. 39, 40; his end is peace, v. 37. He enters eternal rest and heavenly peace. He shall not be forgotten. His works shall follow him and increase his blessings. The comparison between a Christian and the wicked in the light of Scripture, is it not a glorious solution of the vexing problem, v. 1?

H. J. BOUMAN

## Reformation Day

Ps. 119:105

We praise God today for our deliverance from the bondage of Roman error. It was not Luther who delivered us; he was only the instrument. Luther himself confessed: "With might of ours can naught be done." He used the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, the Spirit of His mouth. 2 Thess. 2:8. Luther sang: "One little word can fell him" (Satan). Therefore he insisted so strenuously that nothing but the Word of God be preached and taught. And he labored to bring the Bible to the people, translation. He wrote the Catechism, to make it easy for the people to grasp the fundamental doctrines of the Bible. He refused to recant unless shown by clear Bible words that he was wrong, Worms. Today the Word of God is set aside again in Christendom at large. It is meet therefore to consider —

### Why Is It So Important That We Stand Squarely on the Bible?

1. *Because only then can we avoid error.*
2. *Because only then can we be sure of our salvation*

#### 1

Text. A lamp, a light, is necessary in darkness. We cannot find the way to heaven, "our knowledge, sense, and sight, lie in deepest darkness shrouded." The spiritual darkness in heathen countries. See Is. 60:2; Luke 1:79; John 1:5; Acts 26:18, etc.

It is because of setting aside the true lamp, the true light, the Word of God, that the Church was misled into many errors: supremacy of the Pope, mass, indulgences, saint-worship; worst of all, salvation by works. The true light was discarded, replaced by the so-called light of human reason, and the result: these terrible errors!

Luther by the grace of God rediscovered the true light, he confessed with the inspired writer of our Psalm: Text. And the result: he was saved, and he saved many others, from those errors.

Today the so-called Modernists prefer human reason to the light of the Word of God. The result is denial of the plenary inspiration of the Bible, denial of salvation through Christ's vicarious suffering and death, denial of man's total corruption, the teaching of salvation by man's own works. Terrible errors, by which sinners are robbed of all comfort, led into deeper darkness, humanity is deprived of the vitalizing force of the Gospel, and so the Modernist must share in the responsibility for the low ebb in morality obtaining today.

By the grace of God we have the true light, in its bright rays we clearly see the truth, the truth that makes us free. Let us not fail to use it.



## 2

**Text. *Thy Word.*** The Bible is God's Word. God speaks to us in the Holy Scriptures. 2 Pet. 1:21; 2 Tim. 3:15-17; 1 Cor. 2:13; Luke 11:28. Being the Word of God from beginning to the end, it is reliable to the utmost. Ps. 33:4; Luke 16:17; Matt. 5:18; 24:35; 1 Pet. 1:23, 25.

What the Bible says about our condition: corruption, sinfulness, helplessness, hopelessness, etc., is the truth. It throws the blinding light into the darkness of our ignorance and indifference. It prepares us for the truth that makes us free. What it says about the love of God, that He sent His only-begotten Son, about Jesus' vicarious suffering and death, our redemption from sin, etc., our righteousness through faith in the Redeemer, about the Comforter, about His work of creating and keeping faith through the means of grace, about fatherly, divine guidance through life, about resurrection, etc., etc. — all is true and absolutely reliable. What a blessing!

Under the Pope uncertainty reigns. There is no peace, no sureness; it is hopeless groping, uncertain groping in the dark. Can you be sure of God's forgiving grace? Indeed not, by no means, they say. Certainly, by all means, Luther said, and we say it, too. Why? Because God says so in the Bible. God's faithfulness is the rock of ages upon which we stand. In the Bible we have the sure prophetic Word. 2 Pet. 1:19. We are certain of our salvation because we believe the Word of God.

Let us thank God and praise Him that, through Luther, He has given us anew the true light, without which we would be lost, but with which we can be sure of our salvation. Let us so thank God that we hold the Word of God sacred and gladly hear and learn it, and share this precious gift with our fellow men. Then the Word of God will be a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.

H. J. BOUMAN

### Twentieth Sunday after Trinity

2 Kings 2:6-18

The *Introit* strikes the keynote of the day. Its antiphon, or opening sentence, is taken from Dan. 9. Here the prophet is described as reading from the scroll of Jeremiah (25:11) concerning the seventy years of Israel's captivity, and is moved thereby to confess: Dan. 9:5, 6, 14 and 16-19. How fitting this confession for our day, when God's servants, in congregations and in Synod, are only too frequently being disparaged, and when, as a result, God's hand is most heavy upon us! Let us realize, therefore —

**God Removes and Replaces the Spiritual Leaders of His Church**

1

*God removes the spiritual leaders of His Church when the time of their service is over.*

A. God had appointed Elijah, who became one of Israel's greatest prophets. He was blamed for a drought by King Ahab (1 Kings 18:17); threatened with death by Queen Jezebel (1 Kings 19:1-3); and held in contempt by King Ahaziah (2 Kings 1:1-16).

How frequently we despise the ministrations of our God-appointed pastors! And how often the counsel of Synod's proper representatives falls on deaf ears! (The laity neglects the *Lutheran Witness*; and the clergy, the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, conference papers, etc.)

B. But Elijah's appointment was soon to be terminated (2 Kings 2:1). Elijah realized it, v. 9, and made a final visitation of the prophetic schools, vv. 1, 2, 4. He also made preparations for the future of the Church, v. 9 b. Elisha remained his faithful servant to the end, vv. 2, 4, 6, 11.

How fitting the admonition of our Sunday's Epistle always to be "redeeming the time" (Eph. 5:15, 16), also with respect to the gifts which God has given us in our pastors, teachers, professors, and synodical leaders!

C. The Lord finally removed Elijah by granting him a blessing which Paul had desired in vain (2 Cor. 5:4; cp. also 1 Cor. 15:51, 52). It was a blessed moment for Elijah, but a sad hour for the Church. Realizing that the spiritual leaders are for God's people a fatherly protection, Elisha cried out, saying, v. 12 a, and as a sign of his great grief "rent" his garments "in two pieces," v. 12 b.

It is in like manner a happy day for a Christian leader, when the Lord terminates his ministry and takes him to heaven, but it is always a sad hour for the Church. It is like the loss of a strong spiritual support, "the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof," v. 12. Thus our Synod has felt keenly the loss of Doctors Walther, Pieper, Pfotenhauer, and others.

2

*The Lord, however, replaces those spiritual leaders whom He has removed.*

A. Elisha, first called to serve as an "assistant" to Elijah (1 Kings 19:19-21), was now appointed to replace him. To this end he was granted a special sign, vv. 10, 12, and the power of his former master, vv. 13, 14. The "sons of the prophets" accepted him, v. 15; but he, too, was frequently despised, cp. vv. 16-18; 2 Kings 2:23-25; 6:12, 13.

The Lord appoints other spiritual leaders to replace those

whom He has removed. But, do we always properly appreciate God's replacements? How often the fine gifts of a newly called pastor are disparaged simply because he lacks some special ability of his predecessor!

B. Elisha was a successful leader, because he possessed the right spirit. He was humble, asking only for spiritual gain, for a "double portion" (cp. Deut. 21:17) of Elijah's spirit.

Oh, for prophets in our church who desire above all the "double portion" of the spirit of Elijah! And oh, that our people would seek only such men to serve them!

When we consider our frequent sins against God's spiritual leaders, we, too, might well tremble at the wrath of that King who will certainly punish with eternal destruction all such as despise the invitations and the admonitions of His servants (Matt. 22:3, 5, 6, 7, 12). Let us therefore pray with the day's Collect, "Grant to Thy people . . . pardon and peace, that they may be cleansed from all their sins." And when through the lips of God's servants we are again assured of forgiveness in Christ, may we then determine truly to "serve Him with a quiet mind," always esteeming God's appointed spiritual leaders as a precious gift of God!

THEO. F. NICKEL



---

**Miscellanea**

---

**A Pastor's Daily Prayer**

O almighty God, merciful Father, I, a poor miserable sinner, confess unto Thee all my sins and iniquities; especially do I acknowledge my indolence in prayer, my neglect of Thy Word, and my seeking after good days and vain glory. But I am heartily sorry for them and sincerely repent of them; and I pray Thee, of Thy boundless mercy and for the sake of the holy, innocent, bitter sufferings and death of Thy beloved Son, forgive me all my sins, and be gracious and merciful to me. Yea, cleanse me through Thy Spirit by the blood of Jesus Christ, and give me more and more power and willingness to strive after holiness, for Thou hast called me that I should be holy and blameless before Thee in love.

I thank Thee also, O faithful God, for my family, my wife and children and for all my relatives. Thou hast given them to me purely out of fatherly, divine goodness and mercy, without any merit or worthiness in me. Preserve them in good health, and give them their daily bread; but above all keep them in Thy grace and in the true confession of Thy name unto the end.

Thou, O God of all grace and mercy, hast also called me, a poor unworthy sinner, to be a servant of Thy Word and hast placed me into that office which preaches the reconciliation and hast given me this flock to feed. In and by myself I am wholly incompetent to perform the work of this great office; and, therefore, I pray Thee, make me an able minister of Thy Church. Give me Thy Holy Spirit, the Spirit of wisdom and knowledge, of grace and prayer, of power and strength, of courage and joyfulness, of sanctification, and the fear of God. Fill me with the right knowledge, and open my lips that my mouth may proclaim the honor of Thy name. Fill my heart with a passion for souls and with skillfulness to give unto each and every sheep or lamb entrusted to my care what is due unto it at the proper time. Give me at all times sound advice and just works; and wherever I overlook something or in the weakness of my flesh speak or act wrongly, do Thou set it aright, and help that no one may through me suffer harm to his soul.

Glory and honor, praise and thanks be unto Thee, God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for all the mercy and faithfulness Thou hast shown to this congregation. Thy Word has not returned unto Thee void, but Thou hast here gathered a people that knows Thee and fears Thy name. Give me Thy Holy Spirit, that I may at all times see the good things in this congregation and praise and thank Thee for them. Bless Thy Word in the future, that it may preserve the believers in Thy grace, convert those that are not yet Thine, and bring back the erring and delinquent. Gather Thy people as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and be Thou a wall of fire round about Thy congregation.

Graciously take into Thy fatherly care the sick and the needy, all

widows and orphans, and all who are in any trouble, temptation, anguish of labor, peril of death, or any other adversity. Comfort them, O God, with Thy Holy Spirit, that they may patiently endure their afflictions and acknowledge them as a manifestation of Thy fatherly will. Preserve their soul from faintheartedness and despondency, and help that they may seek Thee, the great Physician of their souls. And if any pass through the valley of the shadow of death, suffer them not, in the last hour, for any pain or fear of death, to fall away from Thee, but let Thine everlasting arms be underneath them, and grant them a peaceful departure and a happy entrance into Thine eternal kingdom.

Furthermore, I pray Thee, Thou wouldest at all times fill the offices of this congregation and its societies with upright, honest, and sincere men and women, who have the welfare of their congregation at heart and are able to help me in my office with their counsel and their deeds. Unite their hearts with me in love for the truth; give them the spirit of prayer for me and for their congregation, so that we may in unity and harmony build Thy kingdom in this place.

And since hypocrites and ungodly people are often found within the visible church organization, I pray Thee, do not permit Satan to disrupt this congregation through such or to hinder the efficiency of my office. If there are such in our midst, let Thy Word be like unto a hammer upon their heart of stone. Have patience with them; but if they persist in their unbelief, hypocrisy, and wickedness, do Thou reveal them so that they may be put forth from Thy congregation. Give me a forgiving heart towards all, and help me, especially for their sake, to speak and act cautiously.

Preserve and keep the youth of our Church from falling away and joining the world, and keep them from the many sins of youth. Thou, O Lord, knowest how difficult it is to lead the young on the right paths and how to divide the word of truth with respect to them; do Thou therefore give me particular wisdom and skill to be stern without estranging their hearts, and mild and charitable without strengthening them in frivolity and unruliness.

Mercifully bless the education and instruction of the children, that they may grow up in Thy fear to the praise of Thy name. Bless the work of our Sunday school teachers, and help them to lead the little ones into the Savior's loving arms. Grant us in due time a Christian day school, where we may more effectively provide Christian training for the lambs of this flock.

To Thy grace and mercy I also commend all my brethren in office. Arrest and suppress all discord and dissension. Give me a brotherly heart towards all and true humility, and help me to bear with patience their casual weakness or deficiencies. Grant that they also may act as true brothers toward me.

Keep and preserve our whole Synod, its teachers and officers, true to Thy Word. Cause the work of our Synod to grow. Guard and protect all members of Synod against sinful ambitions, dissension, and indifference in doctrine and practice. Bless all higher institutions of learning, our colleges, seminaries, and university. Accompany all missionaries on their dangerous ways and help them to perform their work.



Gather the elect from all nations into Thy holy Christian Church, and bring them at last into Thy Church Triumphant in heaven.

Grant also health and prosperity to all that are in authority in our country, especially to the President and Congress of the United States, the Governor and Legislature of this State, and to all judges and magistrates. Endue them with grace to rule after Thy good pleasure, to the maintenance of righteousness and to the hindrance and punishment of wickedness, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

Hear me, most merciful God, in these my humble requests, which I offer up unto Thee in the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, to whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honor and glory, world without end. Amen.

(Translated with adaptations from *Homiletic Magazine*, Vol. 38, 1914  
pages 1-3, by R. Jagels)

### The Social Gospel. What Is It?

We can best understand what the social gospel is by comparing it with the Gospel we have in the Bible.

The Gospel, taking the word in its proper sense, is the glad tidings of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. Its purpose is to re-establish the spiritual relation of man to God, God procuring, offering, and imparting to man forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation, and man accepting these blessings through faith in God's promises. And in the strength of this faith man will then lead a life well pleasing to God. It primarily pertains to the relation of man to his God and only in the second place to his relation to his neighbor.

The social gospel, as its very name indicates, emphasizes the social relations of man and ignores his spiritual wants. In fact, it is a reaction against the preaching of repentance for sin and faith in Christ, and stresses works and conduct and good behavior. Men should not concern themselves so much about the things above and the hereafter, but look after the things here on earth, to improve the social relations of men and nations, their morals and their living conditions, and make this world a better place to live in. Not creeds, but deeds; not what a man believes, but how he lives, that is the most important thing. In order to accomplish this, the social gospel stresses the Law, nor does it hesitate to add rules of its own and have the government enact and enforce laws to regulate and to improve the social relations of man. The social gospel therefore is not really Gospel but Law.

And this, they maintain, is the chief content of Christ's teaching. Christ is to them not the Savior from sin, but rather a new Lawgiver, who wished to raise men to a higher level of personal morality and of social companionship and good will.

Our criticism of this social gospel is this: In the first place it forgets or neglects the deeper spiritual needs of man, namely, to be reconciled to God by faith in Christ Jesus. In the second place it forgets that before the outward life of man can be reformed, his heart must be renewed; a change of life must be preceded by a change of heart. And here again it is faith in the forgiving grace of God that will bring about

this change. In the third place the social gospel does not supply the right motive for a better social life. At best it points to the general social improvement it hopes to accomplish as the motive for our effort in that direction, whereas the Bible says that it is faith, faith in the redeeming grace of God, that worketh by love. In short, the advocates of the social gospel wish to accomplish by the Law what can be accomplished only by the proper use of the Law and the Gospel.

The Law of God is so comprehensive that it covers all social relations of the individual, his relations to his family, to his government, to his neighbor, friends and foes, acquaintances and strangers; and besides regulating his external contacts, it is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of his own heart. There is no personal or social relation for which we do not find sane and reliable directives in the Law of God.—But all this will not put them into operation. Here the Gospel enters in. While its chief purpose is to restore the right relation between God and man, and does so by working in man faith in Christ for the remission of sins, it has for this very reason a secondary effect in that this faith worketh by love, Gal. 5:6, and that this love urges us to keep His Commandments, 1 John 5:3. Thus it is that the Gospel supplies the moving power to do those things which the Law requires, and as a result thereof the social relations and conditions among men will improve. Let us first make men true Christians at heart, and they will then also be true Christians in their lives.

Whatever improvements in the social conditions of mankind have in the past been effected were brought about by the proper use of the Law and the Gospel. Here we have something better and more effective than the social gospel, which does not change the heart of man and would at best only get him to do good for its own sake. But the morality and social improvement achieved by the proper use of the Law and the Gospel is built up on the love of God and love of the neighbor, and is, therefore, ethically considered, of a higher type than any other. But this love, while demanded in the Law, is not by this Law created in our hearts. Love is engendered by love that is experienced. And it is the love of God for us, as revealed in the Gospel, that kindles in our hearts love for Him and love for our neighbor.

Men who advocate the social gospel for the improvement of the social relations of man simply do not understand the functions and the effects of God's Law and Gospel on the human heart, they do not know the difference between the two, and do not rightly divide the word of truth. An error in the understanding of the true nature, purpose, and effect of the Law and the Gospel will lead to many aberrations.

E. W. A. KOEHLER

### Lincoln and Washington As Men of Prayer

On this topic the *Watchman-Examiner* brought an article from which we quote statements of Washington and Lincoln. In his first inaugural address Washington said, "It would be peculiarly improper to omit, in this first official act, my fervent supplications to that almighty Being who rules the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aid can supply every human defect, that His

benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge."

Of Lincoln it is reported that he said to L. D. Chittenden, "That the Almighty does make use of human agencies and directly intervenes in human affairs is one of the plainest statements of the Bible. I have so many evidences of His direction, so many instances when I have been controlled by some other power than my own will, that I cannot doubt that this power comes from above. . . . I am satisfied that when the Almighty wants to do or not to do a particular thing, He finds a way of letting me know it." The last words quoted indicate that Lincoln relied too much on subjective guidance, a thing not absolutely promised us in the Scriptures apart from the leading which is furnished us in the divine Word. But it is cheering for us to see that these two giants of our country's history evidently believed in the efficacy of prayer.

A.

### Calendar Reform and the Date of Easter

In an open letter published in the *Lutheran* Henry W. Snyder speaks of suggestions that have been made with respect to calendar reform and a definite and unchangeable date for Easter. He writes, "The best solution to the problem we have seen so far is that proposed by the World Calendar Association, which suggests April 8 as a date to be fixed for Easter; and according to this new calendar that day would always happen on Sunday. The World Calendar Association proposes that the year be divided into four equal quarters of 91 days each, 13 of which shall be Sundays and 78 weekdays or work days. The first month in each quarter would have five Sundays, 31 days; the other two, four Sundays, or 30 days. This calendar would be perpetual, every year beginning on a Sunday. December 30 would be a Saturday, the 364th day. Then there would be another Saturday, a holiday, designated as Y or year day. The new year would begin again on Sunday. In leap years, a similar day would be intercalated at the end of June, designated as L or leap day. Now, the exact date of Easter when Christ arose is unknown; the traditional date of the crucifixion is April 7. April 8 comes about as near the traditional date for Easter as one can reach and is a happy selection; it is just about midway between the present possible extremes on which the festival can fall. It occurs when spring is fairly under way, and thus gives a greater degree of assurance of good weather. If one may take into consideration finances—and even churches must do so to some extent at least—it is just close enough to the end of a quarter to permit quarterly statements to reach the membership with the probability that delinquents will respond to the Easter urge to meet their pledges; perhaps even to bring them to the church, which most people attend at that season, if at no other. Comparative statistics would be fair comparisons of one year with another.

"Can the calendar be changed? It has been changed. Julius Caesar had an astronomer named Sosijenes change from a chaotic system to

one that was reasonably accurate in 45 B.C. Later another change was needed. The calendar year is  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days; the solar year 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds, a difference of only 11 minutes, 14 seconds. 'A mere trifle,' you say? Yes; but by 1582 Pope Gregory XIII found that the Julian calendar was 10 days short of the solar year. He adopted the present Gregorian calendar, according to which every fourth year is leap year, except those at the end of centuries; these must be divisible by 400 to be leap years. Thus 1900 was not a leap year; 2000 will be."

Speaking of the possibility of bringing people to agree to such a change, Mr. Snyder says, "The change is on the way. Already favorable action has been given by the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work at Geneva, the Eastern Orthodox Church. Even the Roman Catholic Church has said that there exists no dogmatic objection to revision. 14 nations also have given their approval, embracing a wide variety of religious faiths, for example, China, Brazil, Norway, Greece, Turkey." A.

### A Home for Convalescent Theologians?

There are an increasing number of preachers and teachers in our day in all the Protestant churches who are recovering from various forms of acute or chronic theological doubt and uncertainty. One hears of them through the press and listens to them on the radio or in the pulpit. Some convalescents profess that their recovery from critical doubt and barren humanism began by reading Karl Barth or Søren Kierkegaard. Others, like Barth himself, were suddenly aware that their spiritual vision was dim (atrophy of the optical nerves), but it came back through a fresh study of Paul's epistles. The symptoms and the causes of this prevalent return from intellectual and spiritual distress are manifold and multiform. They are mentioned at some length in books such as *Back to Religion*. One of America's theologians and preachers, Dr. Halford Luccock, tells in a religious magazine of his transformation from a modern scientific preacher to one of the most noted Bible preachers in the land. He says:

"I graduated from the theological seminary back in the bronze age; perhaps a better metallurgical term would be 'the age of brass.' In those days quite a number of us young Apollos on graduating, having become men, put away such childish things as texts and Bible stories. I, for one, in the pulpit lived amid the immensities and starry galaxies. But after a while, when the long-suffering congregation had heard my sermon on 'The March of Progress' (for progress was marching in those days), and the one on 'Science and Religion,' and the one on 'Pragmatism' (for pragmatism was going big then), like the Prodigal Son, I began to be in want. Then I came to myself and said, 'In my Father's Book are texts enough and to spare. I will arise and go to the Bible.' I was not the only one with that experience." Yes, there are many more in many pulpits.

Some of these modern spiritual biographies (of the downward path and then the upward climb) of earnest souls are full of pathos. A series of articles appeared some years ago in a leading Christian periodical

telling how certain outstanding preachers had changed their minds (and message?) from "rising doubt and rebel sigh" to a new, although still feeble, grasp of the faith of their fathers. A writer in the *British Weekly* tells of the ravages of this same infantile paralysis across the seas in a review of Gilbert Murray's book *Stoic, Christian, and Humanist*:

"Dr. Gilbert Murray writes as if he surveyed the world with the cool unimpassioned mind that befits an Olympian; but, alas, he is mistaken! He is unable to cast himself loose from the reactions of his youth against the Christianity taught in the Australian bush. He tells us about the Gadarene swine, and the barren fig tree, and eternal damnation, and how he threw Christianity away because of them. Now, when all that makes life precious is perishing in a tornado of destruction, he sets himself to show that the belief in God is only 'man-thinking'; and the belief in immortality only 'wish-thinking'; and that the Christian spirit is only 'humanism' or 'liberalism.' Can it be that our fathers had the treasure and we have lost it? If so, we must find it again. Find it at all costs. What has God done that we should turn our backs on Him and refuse to believe in Him?"

These are noble words and should hearten us all to do something about it to save the stoic and the humanist now. But in the war of the Church Militant, as in the present global war, we will fail if we do too little and are too late. Therefore we must save manpower by opening a Home for Convalescent Soldiers of the Cross and realize that victory comes through prayer power. Those on the road to recovery themselves admit that what they need most is a new, bracing spiritual climate, exercise in winning souls, the real Bread of Life three times daily, without removal of any vitamins, and the new lifeblood from the Vine. The whole head is sick of destructive criticism and humanistic rationalism. The whole heart has become faint in trying to understand the Evolution-of-the-Idea-of-God instead of meeting Him face to face in Jesus Christ our Contemporary. As a professor at Yale expressed it, "I have been reading Anselm and Calvin and Jonathan Edwards of late and am becoming more conservative daily." Of course, there are plenty of such tonics and vitamin products on the theological market, old and new, which the wise can buy and use privately. But this only increases the need for a central Home for Convalescents. Such men need companionship in a new environment, with southern exposure to the Sun of Righteousness and experienced physicians of the theological soul to help them. They also need robust nurses who can administer an occasional injection against the Graf-Wellhausen virus or help remove an unhealthy growth from the system.

We are convinced that if such a Home were accessible and the patients tarried of their own free will, recovery would be rapid and permanent. Now there are many on the way to recovery, but they still look anemic and in need of an invalid's chair. They are on the way back to Paul, but have not yet reached certainty of conviction and fearlessness in their message. We are happy to quote from an anonymous letter written by an elder to his young pastor after the latter's recuperation in such a Home: "Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth. . . . I have no greater



joy than to hear that my children walk in the truth." On last reports Gaius was in splendid health, and he had good report from all men that his preaching was with the power of the truth, Diotrophes and Demas notwithstanding. The same was true of Demetrius, mentioned in a postscript.

SAMUEL W. ZWEMER, D. D., in *The Presbyterian*, March 25, 1943

### Ulrik V. Koren, D. D., the Theologian

Dr. Koren was evidently one of those strong figures in the history of the Church who was genuinely loved by those who agreed with him and as genuinely feared by those who disagreed with him. The simple explanation of this is the truth long taught by experience that a mighty defender of a friend must at the same time be a strong opponent of the enemy. Those who loved the truth loved Dr. Koren, who so valiantly defended that truth; but those who loved error feared Dr. Koren, who so fearlessly made war upon that error.

Thus we immediately begin to muse at the very mention of Dr. Koren as a theologian. His life and activity were so intimately associated with the wars of our Church that his very name recalls strife. And let those who love error decry that name as much as they will; we love it for what it calls to mind, a heroic battle in defense of that truth which gives us an eternal hope.

We often wonder why men of Dr. Koren's type should be made the center of so much opposition. Those who knew him as a pastor remember him for his simple Gospel sermons, his faithful ministering to the sick, the dying, and the afflicted, and his unselfish and untiring efforts as a missionary, braving the hardships of pioneer life to bring the cup of consolation to souls in distress. In his home and among his associates he was a husband, father, and friend who was kind and considerate and to be trusted implicitly. As a man among men he had the bearing of those who are well born and well bred, the brow of a scholar, the vision of a statesman, the tongue of an orator, the eye of one who is called to command. He was a natural leader among his fellows and recognized by them as such, being elected to responsible positions as a self-evident thing. And as a leader he was willing and able to assume the responsibilities of his office. He never shirked the arduous tasks that his office imposed upon him, and in judgment as well as in the carrying out of his duties he presented a worthy ideal of integrity and dependability.

We wonder the more when we learn to know the man at closer range. It is true, Dr. Koren could be both stern and even harsh, at times, in his words and demeanor. But he who reads Dr. Koren's circular letters as president to his brother pastors and such other documents from his pen will be drawn to him by the love they breathe, a fervent love of the Gospel and of souls purchased by the blood of Christ. He who reads will be touched similarly by his evident personal humility, by which Koren himself was nothing and his Redeemer was all. In his office he was but a servant and fellow laborer with his brethren. One thing he abhorred with the whole force of his strong personality, namely, all that savored of sham and pretense. In combating or characterizing

any show of dishonesty, hypocrisy, or vain boasting, he spared no one, and there his words disclose the vehemence he felt. His whole nature rebelled against shallowness and deceit and conceit in any form.

Do we not recognize in all of this characteristics of the true Christian and Lutheran theologian? Let us recall how tenderly Christ Himself preached the Gospel, but how sharply He rebuked the hypocritical Pharisees, and was He not genuinely feared and hated for this? Let us remind ourselves of the example of Paul and his presentation of Christian doctrine, how intent he was on preaching Christ and Him Crucified, His abounding grace to the complete exclusion of all merit and worthiness of man, but how relentlessly he declared and waged war on every form of error that threatened to obscure this same Christ and His grace. Consider Luther, who spared nothing in his eagerness to bring to his countrymen the sweet comfort he had found in the Gospel; but Luther's thunderous denunciation of error is re-echoed to this day. And as the Master, Christ, was made to suffer hatred and persecution because of His preaching of Law and Gospel, so the servant Paul and the servant Luther and the servants Walther and Koren and the rest.

From the very beginning of Koren's ministry in this country, his work was of that twofold kind: that of the trowel and of the sword, of building and waging war, of teaching the truth and warding off error. Koren, as one of the earliest of our pioneer pastors, played a chief part in the establishing of the newly organized synod on a solid foundation of truth. That foundation was the eternal bedrock which is Christ. And the mighty pillars by which the Church of God is fitly joined together Koren was along in establishing in the midst of that Church: the Word of God as the only norm of faith and life and the doctrine of justification by faith alone without the works of the Law as the central and saving truth of that Word.

With all his learning, his keenness of intellect, his training in philosophical thinking, his wide acquaintance with books, Dr. Koren boasted only one thing so far as learning goes: a childlike obedience to the simple Word of God. With all his piety, labors, sacrifices for the Church, Dr. Koren boasted nothing save the Gospel of a free forgiveness of sin through Christ. His whole theology was borne along on the wings of these two truths, as he himself says in one of his classic writings:

These were the truths which lay the foundation for the Lutheran Reformation; and where the Lutheran Church has continued true to its mission, this has been accomplished by the faithful adherence to these principles. For it is these principles which bring it about that we do not become as reeds which are swayed hither and thither by the many changing winds of doctrine. These alone lay the true and firm foundation for a right conversion and a sincere repentance. These alone preserve us from every temptation to labor for the Kingdom of God by new devices, self-chosen worship and ecclesiastico-political schemes. These truths alone establish the heart, set the conscience free, and at the same time teach [a man] to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling and to have the assurance of faith regarding eternal salvation. These were the truths which were our light in the days when zeal and activity were most marked in the Norwegian Synod, and it was these truths for which we battled in the days to which the publication of the *Konferens* so mockingly refers in the words: "Now they are writing again in the style which was common twenty years ago." It is true,

we have discovered nothing new. We continue to battle for those things for which we battled then, the two above-mentioned principles. The writer can prove that he in all general conventions where he was present, as well as in all our own synodical conventions, has sought according to his ability to have these two principles recognized and established. And after a discussion, particularly of the first of these principles, the doctrine regarding Holy Scriptures (*Skriptprincippet*), he has heard the following declaration made by one of the best-known men of the Konferens: "Now, I understand finally what it is that the Norwegian Synod has been seeking (wanting)"; while another who also had been in the service of this same body declared that he well realized that what we had presented was the sound and original Lutheran principle regarding the Scriptures, but he added humbly that he himself had not quite grasped it.<sup>1)</sup>

When Koren was asked to encourage, comfort, and strengthen the members of the Synod to carry on, he says that he could find no better means or remedy than to direct them again to study these two great principles of the Church of the Reformation. And it was the sacred responsibility, he maintained, of clergy and laity alike to continue to study these prayerfully, diligently, and earnestly, that they might become fully established in them.

A theologian who has accepted these two principles as the mighty pillars of his teaching has learned to look altogether away from himself. Where the Bible is recognized as the inspired Word of God and the sole norm of faith and life, there man with his own opinion and logic and reason cannot play the master. There pride must go. There doubtings and questionings and fears must give place to the sure promises of the clear Word. Again, where the second principle of the Reformation, the justification of a sinner before God by grace through faith, is permitted to stand, there, too, pride must go. There all boasting must cease. There fear gives way to peace, despair to hope, and sadness to joy. There the false comfort of a salvation through works or good conduct or prayers and any effort that is of man is banished before the shining brightness of the eternal message from the cross of the gracious forgiveness of sins, all sins, through the all-sufficient merit of Christ. It was this pure Gospel message which God permitted Dr. Koren to bring to our Church, a Gospel which was neither conditioned nor abbreviated, neither beclouded nor disguised, neither adulterated nor uncertain, but God's own message, clear, pure and complete, to comfort and to save.

In the bright light of a theology that bears this message and is upheld by these principles, error appears in its true garb. Before an uncertain Word and an adulterated Gospel error may seem quite innocent. And when Eielsen came and Schmidt and the rest, some thought there was no harm in their doctrines and confused them with the truth, and that simply because men had succeeded in making the Word seem unclear and grace a thing which was dependent at least in part on man himself. In righteous anger Dr. Koren let the full light of the truth reveal the real character of these errors: as sin against the holy majesty of God, for they dared to oppose the clear Word of very God; the real consequences of these errors, since they robbed sinners of their only

1) U. V. Koren, "Hvad den norske synode har villet og fremdeles vil," *Samlede Skrifter*, III, 379, 380.

comfort and hope; and the dangers to the Church of Christ of these errors, if they should prevail, since a half Gospel or part Gospel is no Gospel at all. Where man's conduct or effort, no matter how apparently small that effort may be, is permitted to have a place in the doctrine of the forgiveness of sin, there Christ is mocked, His grace is obscured, His merit has become insufficient, and the hope of the Church an uncertain thing. God gave to Dr. Koren the faithfulness and the courage and the strength and the patience and the conviction to take the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, and wield it so mightily in defense of the truth.

The name Dr. Koren is not a name to be forgotten, though he would gladly have it so if only the message he preached and the warning he gave would continue on and not be forgotten. Just as we associate the name of Paul or David or Moses or Abraham or Luther or Walther with certain definite conditions in the Church, certain definite experiences of the Church, and therefore certain definite lessons which God taught the Church through these messengers of His, so the name of Dr. Koren recalls and should recall certain definite lessons which God has taught our Church through this man of God. The message, even the very specific message, that God gave His Church through Abraham or David, has been preserved for the Church of our day by the grace of God in order that we might continue to learn from it comfort or admonition as the need arises. The writings of Dr. Koren have not been inspired as the words which we have from the mouth of a David or an Abraham, and we cannot look to them as such. But the Gospel which Koren preached, the admonition he brought, the doctrines he taught are those of the Word of God and applied to conditions and needs of our Church which are ever present. We still have the errors of an Eielsen and a Schmidt to contend with, and we still have those arising from time to time in the Church who make light of both the first and the second great pillar of the Church of the Reformation, the Word as the only rule of faith and conduct and the doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the Law. We would honor Dr. Koren aright if we would continue to remember his name and teach it to our children, not as a name by itself or as honoring the man who bore it, but as recalling to us and to them the experiences of the Church with which the name is identified and the blessings God in mercy brought our Church in and through the man who bore that name. And the writings of Dr. Koren are there today to help us in all of this.

One lesson we would learn in particular. When we study the ways of the Church today, consider its frantic attempts at publicity, its feverish activity in this organization or committee and that, its busyness and its noise about outward things, then we do well in studying and restudying the life and work of Dr. Koren, and then in particular the theology of Dr. Koren. How high he towers above the pettiness of the temporal affairs of the Church, and how his example calls to us to make the Gospel with its eternal message of the love of God in Christ our one and serious concern! His voice is heard today in the writings he has left, as in the memories of those who listened at his feet, and that voice speaks to us of

those eternal truths of which we all, as individuals or as a Church, shall ever be in need. He calls to us to mind the heavenly things, to busy ourselves with the sacred doctrines as with God's greatest gift, to hate and abhor what is false and a lie as we hate and abhor him who is the father of lies, and to despise and shun vainglory and show that the glory of God may remain great. Dr. Koren calls to us, his spiritual sons and daughters, to use the trowel and wield the sword, to build and to fight, that the Church of God may be alike built and protected in the midst of an untoward generation. And when our bodies grow weary and our spirits faint, when success seems so far and defeat so near, when friends fail and foes grow strong, when we are made to cry with Asaph (Ps. 80): "Thou makest us a strife unto our neighbors; and our enemies laugh among themselves," then he points us to that Word which abideth forever and that grace which never fails. When the Church, even our Church, seems like that vineyard whose hedges were broken down, which all they that passed by did pluck, which the boar out of the wood did waste and the wild beast of the field did devour (Ps. 80), then again Dr. Koren, as a messenger of God, shows us the strong foundation which is Christ, the two mighty pillars of truth which uphold that Church, and the glorious promise of Him who is the Truth: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Who of us who were privileged to know Dr. Koren personally can forget the sure comfort he holds out to each Christian from the Word of God, a comfort which is the great message of the Church and about which our every activity in the Church should be centered:

God has promised that He will never leave us nor forsake us; Christ has promised that no man shall pluck us out of His hand—and we are not willing to believe this! Christ would that we should find comfort in the fact that all the hairs of our head are numbered; how much more would He not have us find comfort in the assurance of faith in the fact that He has resolved to preserve our soul! Let His Holy Name be praised! 2)

In faith Asaph prayed: "Turn us again, O God, and cause Thy face to shine; and we shall be saved." He prayed again and said: "Turn us again, O God of hosts, and cause Thy face to shine; and we shall be saved." In full assurance he prayed again: "Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts, cause Thy face to shine; and we shall be saved" (Ps. 80). And as we think of the theology of Dr. Koren, we think of it as a theology which he believed and by which he received the assurance of faith regarding his own heavenly birthright, so that he could make the contents and spirit of the one-hundredth psalm his own and sing with the simple trust of a child:

Ye lands, to the Lord make a jubilant noise;  
 Glory be to God!  
 Oh, serve Him with joy, in His presence now rejoice;  
 Sing praise unto God out of Zion!

Not we, but the Lord is our Maker, our God;  
 Glory be to God!  
 His people we are and the sheep led by His rod;  
 Sing praise unto God out of Zion!

2) Koren, "Kan en kristen våre vis paa sin salighed?" *op. cit.*, III, 374.



Oh, enter His gates with thanksgiving and praise;  
 Glory be to God!  
 To bless Him and thank Him our voices we will raise;  
 Sing praise unto God out of Zion!

For good is the Lord, and His mercy is sure;  
 Glory be to God!  
 To all generations His truth shall still endure;  
 Sing praise unto God out of Zion!

Mankato, Minn.

S. C. YLVISAKER

### William Shakspeare's Petty School

By T. W. Baldwin. Urbana, The University of Illinois Press, 1943. 1 preliminary leaf, 240 pages, illustrated with facsimiles, the end papers also consist of facsimiles (from horn books). 7×10 inches. (University of Illinois Seventy-fifth Anniversary Series). Price, \$3.00.

Before attempting to describe *William Shakspeare's Petty School*, it seems proper to introduce the author, Thomas Whitfield Baldwin. He was born in 1890, so that he is now at the height of his powers. He attended Erskine College (A. B., 1909) and received his Ph. D. at Princeton in 1916, his dissertation being *An Edition of Philip Massinger's "Duke of Milan."* He has been at the University of Illinois since 1925, attaining the rank of Professor of English in 1928. His courses in English literature cover several areas of that vast domain, but his main interest has been the Elizabethan period, his research being concentrated particularly upon Shakspeare. His attitude is that of the American scholar. European scholarship, transplanted to this country, has developed an independent and characteristic quality of its own. German thoroughness, French lucidity, English practicality, have been united with American objectivity and forthrightness—for we are removed, more or less, from European feuds and fetishes there held in high regard. Baldwin combines thorough knowledge and appreciation of the Shakspearean age with straightforward objectivity. The sly humor with which he has spiced his work indicates that he agrees with Puck's dictum: "What fools these mortals be."

In considering Shakspeare's education we find that he would have attended the petty school till he had completed his sixth year, after having spent about two years in it, i. e., from about 1568 to 1570. Those who attended grammar school usually left that school for the university, varying in age from 15 to 17 years; Shakspeare did not proceed to the university, and it seems that he concluded his formal education in, perhaps, his sixteenth year, i. e., about 1579—80. Having decided that it was necessary to study the schoolbooks of Shakspeare's time, Baldwin began to collect schoolbooks of that period; when the original editions themselves were not available, he procured photostats. What the University of Illinois Library has of such schoolbooks plus Baldwin's private holdings constitutes a collection probably as representative and complete as any in this field. When the University of Illinois celebrated its Seventy-fifth Anniversary on March 2, 1943, it was appropriate to issue, as one of the Anniversary Series, Baldwin's *William Shakspeare's Petty School*, recently off the press. His book on the grammar school, *William*

Shakspeare's "Small Latine and Lesse Greeke," will also be published in the Anniversary Series.

Baldwin's *Petty School* is meticulously accurate. Most books have some misprints, and there are, most probably, some in this book, but they are hard to find. The reader is warned against assuming that peculiar spellings in quotations from Elizabethan works are misprints (cf. similar instances in Wm. Dallmann's articles in C.T.M.), and, in the case of Latin quotations, it will be found that what appear to be mistakes, e.g., a wrong case ending, are merely exact quotations of the original. Baldwin has not bothered to put *sic* after such instances; for the quotes enclosing the passage make the original responsible. The book is embellished with a few appropriate illustrations (facsimiles), including one showing a schoolroom, with Launce's dog, occupied with a bone, lying on the floor (cf. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*).

The scope of Baldwin's work is indicated by its chapter headings:

I. The Theory and the Practice of the English Petty School in Shakspeare's Day. II. The Formation of the Authorized *Primer* and *Catechism*. III. The *Primer* and *Catechism* of Shakspeare's Day. IV. The System of Religious Training in Shakspeare's Schooldays. V. The Forms of Nowell's *Catechism*. VI. The Form of Shakspeare's *ABC with the Catechism*. VII. Shakspeare's *Abcedarius*. VIII. Shakspeare's Writing and Casting Accounts. IX. Shakspeare's Reflections of *THE ABC with the Catechism*. X. Shakspeare's Reflections of Other Materials from the *Primer*. XI. William Shakspeare, Anglican.

Specialists in Shakspeare and in the education of his time will here find much to occupy their attention. The ordinary layman, however, likes to ask two questions: "Did Shakspeare have enough knowledge to have been able to write the plays and poems attributed to him?" and "What was Shakspeare's religion?"

The latter of these questions is dealt with in the last chapter, covering pages 216 to 224. Relying solely upon internal evidence, one may make Shakspeare out to be almost anything. He is anti-Semite: "Liver of blaspheming Jew" (*Macbeth*, IV, 1:26); he is pro-Jewish: "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew . . . senses . . . subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means . . . as a Christian is?" (*Merchant of Venice*, III, 1:61-6).

Baldwin settles the matter thus:

"We know that Shakspeare was baptized into, trained up in, and conformed to the Church of England. That is a matter of record, not of inference, though the legitimate inferences support those facts" (p. 221).

It is a recorded fact, for instance, that Shakspeare stood godfather to William Walker on Oct. 16, 1608. As such he would have to be a communicant member of the Church of England. The circumstances of this occasion and the vows he had to renew for himself and take for his godson are given on pp. 219-221 (see also Baldwin's *William Shakespeare Adapts a Hanging*, pp. 135-139).

It is, perhaps, justifiable to infer that Shakspeare's loyalty to the national church was connected with his patriotism as an Englishman. It may not be too much to say that his historical plays indicate that the wave of nationalism that was gathering momentum throughout

Europe was particularly strong in England and in the national poet, Shakspeare:

"This royal throne of kings, this scept'red isle . . .  
This precious stone set in the silver sea,  
Which serves it in the office of a wall . . .  
Against the envy of less happier lands,  
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England."

(*Richard II*, II, 1:39-50.)

The concluding words of *King John* probably reflect what a patriotic Englishman of Shakspeare's day would feel about the international manipulations of the Papacy:

"This England never did, nor never shall,  
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror,  
But when it first did help to wound itself,  
. . . Nought shall make us rue,  
If England to itself do rest but true."

Let us return to the first of the layman's two questions. Did Shakspeare know enough to be able to write what has been attributed to him? His apparently encyclopedic knowledge may not, necessarily, be the result of university training or of extensive and intensive studies. For instance, his quotations from the Bible may be confined to passages learned from a religious schoolbook. Anglicans interested in the history of their Catechism, as it appears today in the *Book of Common Prayer*, will find material here concerning its pre-history, particularly in Chapter V: "The Forms of Nowell's Catechism" (pp.108-120). The curriculum of the petty school included also reading, some preparation for Latin grammar, writing and arithmetic (all this before the child was seven years old). On the whole, the emphasis was on religion:

"In the petty school of Shakspeare's day there was no touch of Renaissance, only English Reformation" (p.217).

"At first, such external influences as there were upon English Reformation had been of a Lutheran cast. . . . But those who . . . were to become bishops and high officials under Elizabeth had come into close contact in one way or another with the ideas of Geneva" (p.222).

It may be of some interest here to point out a technique in statecraft practiced by the Tudor dictators. While Henry VIII, apart from his attitude toward Papal Supremacy, was by conviction a Roman Catholic, yet he was just as Protestant as Luther in his endeavors to make education universal; so, when the decision eventually came in his conflict with the Papacy, he had the bulk of the English people with him. Elizabeth continued his policy. It is worth noting that in 1571 schoolmasters were thus directed:

" . . . And once euery yeare they shall signifie to the Byshop, what chosen scholers they haue of all their number, which are of that aptnes, and so forward in learning, that there may be good hope they will become fitte, either for the common wealth, or for the holy ministerie" (p.86).

Such an educational system hallowed loyalty to family, to State, and to Church, with the sanction of religion. Thus it was that so many had strength to sacrifice all, even life itself, for the sake of religion or patriotism.

The educational system below university level included also the grammar school. Baldwin will deal with that in his (as yet unpublished) *William Shakspeare's "Small Latine and Lesse Greeke."* If it is permissible to anticipate the findings of that treatise, it might be said that the ordinary education of Shakspeare's day not only gave him enough knowledge to be able to write his works, but — and this must be emphasized — it was this education that produced generations capable of appreciating Shakspeare. He would not have been the popular dramatist he was unless his audiences had had the same education as he and thus had the necessary background for enjoying his plays.

These considerations lead us to look at education here and now. We do not teach our seven-year olds as they were taught in Shakspeare's day. An ordinary audience today would not be able to appreciate the Biblical, literary, and historical allusions that were familiar to a similar audience in Shakspeare's day. Among schools below university level that, at the present time, make any serious efforts to realize the ideals of the schools in Shakspeare's day, the church schools must be put in the first rank (or, shall we say that they are alone in making this attempt?). These are the parochial schools and the church colleges. First and foremost they serve religion (wherefore it is essential they teach orthodox religion); they also serve the nation; they are a bulwark of democracy, for those who have been subjected to their influence have been effectively inoculated against the virus of totalitarianism.

As has already been intimated, these schools place religious values first, while everything else is considered incidental, being bestowed upon us, as a matter of course, by the Providence of a loving God. Cultural values and what belongs to material well-being, such as good crops, automobiles, and the like, are among these incidentals. We believe that faith in the God-Man Christ, in bringing us to a true understanding of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, also makes us better able to give to the cultural and material values their proper places in our lives and in our civilization. We reject the humanistic doctrine that cultural values should come first. We reject the materialistic-hedonistic doctrine that bodily well-being should come first — a doctrine that has found expression in the slogan "Let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die" (1 Cor. 15:32).

We trust that our heavenly Father will, for our Savior's sake, forgive us our inability to carry out perfectly the ideals of our religion. In the meantime it is our privilege and our duty, and the privilege and the duty of our church schools, earnestly to strive, under the leadership of the Captain of our salvation (Heb. 2:10), toward the highest possible realization of these ideals. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33).

Urbana, Illinois

C. U. FAYE



---

## Theological Observer

---

**In Memory of Dr. Adolph Hult.** The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, as also other periodicals of our Church, such as the *Lutheraner* and the *Lutheran Witness*, have already taken notice of the departure of Dr. A. Hult, professor of theology at the Theological Seminary, Rock Island (Augustana Synod), which took place on March 6 of this year, in terms praising his conservative stand as a theologian and his constant efforts on behalf of Lutheran orthodoxy in his own synod and others. It may perhaps not be out of place to quote also what the *Theologische Quartalschrift* (July, 1943) has to say of this conservative theologian, who with many others in the American Lutheran Conference fought the good fight for Biblical truth in a most laudable way. The *Theologische Quartalschrift* writes of him, among other things: "He was perhaps better known and more appreciated in our circles than any other theologian of his synod. His name stood for conservative Lutheranism, of which he was an outstanding exponent in his synod." The article then quotes the *Lutheran Companion* of his own synod and the *Lutheran Witness* on the importance of his work as a leading churchman and offers between the two one from the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (A. L. C.) which, we believe, should be given also here. We read: "Dr. Hult was a nobleman of fine culture and devoted Christian spirit, especially at home in secular and in religious music, well acquainted with the hymnological treasures of our church, in the German language as well as in the Scandinavian. He was a thorough theologian. He was better versed in the great German theological works than many theologians whose mother tongue is German. He was a sound Lutheran theologian. They sometimes called him 'the confessional watchdog' of his synod. His was no cold dogmatism. Biblical truth and Lutheran confession permeated with life were his highest treasures. Here he stood firm as a rock."

Conservatives like Dr. Hult account for the fact why many in our Synod, as also in the Synodical Conference as a whole, are not yet willing to break off negotiations with synods which by improper affiliation and other obstacles impeding Lutheran church union render it difficult for some to believe any further in the possibility of achieving a church union which does justice to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions. Are there not in these synods many who are willing to serve as "confessional watchdogs" if only they are given proper support? Certainly, reports from intersynodical conferences suggest that in large circles there are indeed many conservatives of the type of Dr. Hult. They may not be as vocal as the liberal group, but they, nevertheless, are active in a quiet way. But could not perhaps even some of the liberals be moved to listen to God's Word if only it were presented to them in a winning, convincing way? Properly interpreted, God's earnest admonition applies also here: "Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die" (Rev. 3:2). We wonder what might



have happened in the 70's, when our Church was dealing with representatives of the General Council on behalf of church union, had not the predestinarian controversy and other factors brought the negotiations to a close? To us at any rate it seems to be a fair principle that as long as we are given opportunity to witness to the truth, that opportunity should be regarded as a challenge and responsibility. J. T. M.

**Articles on Lutheran Church Union.** Persons blessed with many exchanges at present cannot help reading many articles on Lutheran church union—bad, indifferent, and good. Bad, for example, are such articles as transfer the subject from the realm of clear and sober Christian thinking to that of undue emotionalism, trying either to whip recalcitrant nonconformists into line or inciting sentiment against this or that synod by "atrocities stories." Thus much has been made in recent months of the supposed refusal of two Missouri Synod pastors to admit to Holy Communion certain servicemen of other synods, and much bitterness and anti-Missouri sentiment has been created by this unfriendly and inconsiderate representation, though afterwards on inquiry it was ascertained that there was "another side" to one story, while the other could not at all be verified. Here was regrettable hasty action, doing much to prevent Lutheran church union, and as the *American Lutheran* (August, 1943) says, "not worthy of comment in a sermon or a national monthly." During the past summer the writer served as guest pastor for his son in West Palm Beach, Fla., where many servicemen from a number of near-by camps and many Spars from the Biltmore Hotel attend the Missouri Synod services. Though acting in agreement with the stipulation of the Army and Navy Commission in general, the pastor refused Holy Communion to two service-women, one who announced for the Lord's Table just before the beginning of the service so that there was not enough time for the discussion of sacramental fellowship, and another who was so unaware of her Lutheran affiliation that she knew the names neither of her pastor nor of her church nor of her synod, so that also she was asked to defer her sacramental communion. The minister's practice was no different when he dealt with members of the Synodical Conference coming to him under similar circumstances, though, almost without exception, these were supplied with "Communion certificates" by their pastors. Now, if these two ladies would have rashly reported their experiences, there might have been some more "Missouri Synod atrocity stories," and more bitterness against Missouri, especially among laymen not understanding the issue, might have been spread. Perhaps they did not, for the minister, as well as the time allowed, explained to them the problem involved in sacramental communion, and apparently they were satisfied with his pastoral advice.—Again, the Lutheran church movement is not furthered when the real point at issue is circumvented and such things are urged as: "This can be done only [church union can be promoted] when we acknowledge each other as Lutherans, cease our petty bickerings and misunderstandings, call a halt to our destructive competition and duplications, seek mutual forgiveness for our unchristian jealousies and recriminations, and learn to pray, worship, and commune together as brethren in the faith." Such

a representation ignores the fact that there still exist obstacles, serious enough to separate the various synods, such as, for example, the lodge question, pulpit and altar fellowship with sectarian denominations, the denial of Biblical inspiration, and perhaps others. The matter, impeding church union, is not at all one of "petty bickerings and misunderstandings," but one of Christian doctrine and practice, about which not only Missouri, but also many Lutherans in other synods are vitally concerned.—Nor does it help the movement if such things are said as: "I think it [a certain article] is timely and perhaps will help some of the rest of us to 'be patient with Missouri' until the trends that are in evidence today within that body can work themselves out in the direction of greater friendliness toward other Lutherans." If the matter were one merely of "greater friendliness," Missouri (as an organization) would not hesitate a moment to consummate and declare altar and pupil fellowship with all non-Synodical Conference Lutherans. The fact of "greater friendliness" is very much beside the point. There are definite principles at stake, which Missouri finds herself conscience-bound to hold, and these principles are evidently shared also by many members of non-Missouri synods.—Again, the matter of Lutheran church union may be impeded by too much writing on the subject. We believe that the various synods did well to entrust the matter of church union to commissions, consisting of sober and fair-minded men, instructing them to arrive at an understanding not by way of public controversy, but by discussing the various issues in restricted group conferences. Too much writing on the matter certainly causes confusion and may produce endless strife and debate. This does not mean that there should be no non-official writing on the score, but let all who do write, remember their grave responsibility before God and the Church and write only after much clear and objective thinking and with much sincere charity, and, above all, with their minds fixed upon God's Word as the only norm and guide, and not on transitory earthly values.—But despite all the travail connected with the present union movement, there is much at which one may rejoice. For one thing, there is for the most part that right and godly kind of controversy which brings into focus the Word of God and impresses the Church with its central duty of proclaiming the Law and the Gospel in their Scriptural purity. The result has been greater clarity in viewing important questions. The timely Graebner-Kretzmann contribution *Toward Lutheran Union*, numerous articles in the *Lutheran Witness*, the *Lutheraner*, the *American Lutheran*, not to speak of such as appeared in non-Synodical Conference periodicals (we are just thinking of what Dr. Reu has written in the interest of truth and fairness), in periodicals of other synods of the Synodical Conference, and last, but not least, those that came to us through the *Australasian Review*, have shed much new light on the difficult problem and done much rightly to orient the movement. After all, the basic questions underlying the whole movement are few and simple: "What really is it about?" "What does God's Word say or not say on this point or that?" "Are we willing to accept God's Word?" These questions, rightly considered, will suggest Luther's charitable and objective controversial methodology: "On this point we may yield. On that point

we may bear for a while. On these points we cannot yield an inch." Luther did not settle all controversies that arose at his time. Nor are we able by our reason or strength to bring about a church union pleasing to God. That after all is the Lord's own special and gracious gift. But we may witness to the truth as it is set forth in clear words in Holy Scripture, and if through the omnipotent divine Word the Lutherans in our land will be moved to see eye to eye in matters of faith and life, the problem facing them is gloriously solved. And we do believe that on the whole through the study of God's Word we are slowly moving toward a better understanding and a deeper appreciation of the issues at stake. — And one more point. After Luther's death the controversies that troubled Lutheranism were settled neither by the too ardent orthodoxists, nor by the yielding liberalists, but by the moderate, rather nonvocal but extremely loyal central party, represented by men like Martin Chemnitz, who were deeply grounded in Lutheran theology and firm in their Lutheran convictions, yet ready to yield in all matters of adiaphora, while keeping in mind that it is the glory of the Christian Church to hold the Word and preach the Word. Much emphasis is now being placed on prayer fellowship. Certainly, true unity in teaching and practice will not be granted to Lutheranism in America unless with prayerful meditation of the divine Word we make Christ's sublime intercession our own: "Sanctify them (us) through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth" (John 17:17). — And last, but not least. As has been said time and again, there must be more contacts, not contacts of unionism and indifferentism, but contacts of brotherly charity and Christian helpfulness to attain the goal: "That ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10). J. T. M.

**From St. Louis via Mendota and Louisville — Whither?** One of our most welcome exchanges is the *Australasian Theological Review*, edited by the Rev. Dr. H. Hamann, president of Concordia College, Unley, S. A., who is noted for his brilliant style, keen analysis, and good judgment. In the January-March, 1943, number he presents to his readers a bird's-eye view of the Lutheran church union movement in the United States, to which he appends both criticism and prediction. The value of the article lies chiefly in the objective estimate of the movement by a learned, unbiased, fair-minded scholar, who is so far removed from the field of events that he must depend entirely on the (somewhat limited) articles which he reads on the subject. We believe that Dr. Hamann on most points hits the nail squarely on the head and that our readers will appreciate his evaluation even where they do not agree with him. He writes: "It was at St. Louis, in the year 1938, that the convention of the Missouri Synod adopted certain resolutions which, together with similar action by the American Lutheran Church, gave rise to the hope that the contemplated establishment of fellowship between these two Lutheran bodies would be consummated within a comparatively short time. It was perhaps unexpected, and it is certainly to be regretted, that this hope grew steadily more dim as time went on. As regards the Missouri Synod, voices raised within that body as well as in the affiliated synods charged the doctrinal basis with a lack of completeness and

clarity. It is no exaggeration to speak of strong opposition to the resolutions of 1938. Yet the Missouri Synod, in its convention of 1941, while expressing regret 'that the American Lutheran Church as a body has not taken as firm an attitude in reference to establishing doctrinal unity as under the circumstances we had reason to hope for,' did not in any way rescind or invalidate or weaken its action of 1938; and the Synodical Conference, while requesting that final action be postponed until certain questions raised had been cleared up, and while urging the advisability of formulating a single document of union, did nothing to discourage the movement, still less did it close the door to further negotiations. What attempts or efforts were made by the American Lutheran Church to bring its partners in the American Lutheran Conference, the Norwegian Synod and the Augustana Synod, into line with its *Declaration* and with the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod, we do not know; but it is unfortunately true that its promise to make such efforts were, at least to a certain extent, counteracted by its *a priori* declaration: 'We are not willing to give up our membership in the American Lutheran Conference.' Divergent opinion within the A. L. C. on this entire matter was indicated occasionally by what some men wrote in its publications and by reports on the results of joint conferences between members of the A. L. C. and members of the Missouri Synod. Then came the *Pittsburgh Agreement*, the fruit of negotiations between the American Lutheran Church and the United Lutheran Church, which was eventually adopted by both bodies. This development augured ill for the discussion between the A. L. C. and the Missouri Synod (Synodical Conference). For that document is, by reason of its extremely limited range, far too brief to constitute an acceptable doctrinal basis; its statement on Inspiration is justly regarded as inadequate in view of the circumstances that gave it birth; and it met with determined opposition from sections within the U. L. C. A. Still, however ominous this *Agreement* was in view of the continued negotiations with Missouri, only people who knew much more about the trend of events than the present writer could have been prepared for the bomb released by the A. L. C., when it adopted its *Union Resolutions* at Mendota, Ill., in October, 1942. Our readers will have seen the text in the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* (December, 1942, p. 943). Briefly, the American Lutheran Church declared its readiness to establish pulpit and altar fellowship with either or both the Missouri Synod and the United Lutheran Church; such fellowship to be based on 'their full and wholehearted acceptance of, and adherence to, either of these documents' (i. e., the *Pittsburgh Agreement* on the one hand, and the *Brief Statement* with the *Declaration* on the other). It may be noted in this connection that, according to the Preamble, the A. L. C. accepted the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod 'in the light of the *Declaration* of the A. L. C.' This is historically not true. There is no such thing in the *Declaration*. The phrase 'viewed in the light of the *Declaration*' was first used at Sandusky, we believe, and with a very limited meaning, as the context makes clear. However, all that is past. The very fact that the A. L. C., while stretching out one hand to Missouri, extends the other to the U. L. C. A., makes it impossible for Missouri to accept, unless it can hold

out its other hand to the U. L. C. A. and thus complete the circle. Besides, the U. L. C. A. has already grasped the outstretched hand of the A. L. C. During its convention held at Louisville, Kentucky, it adopted the following resolution, according to the *Theologische Quartalschrift* of January, 1943 (p. 66): 'Resolved, that (1) We receive with appreciation and deep gratitude to God the resolution of the A. L. C. in convention assembled at Mendota, Ill., which recognizes our fundamental agreement and proclaims their readiness to establish full pulpit and altar fellowship with the U. L. C. A. (2) We instruct the president of our church, in conjunction with the president of the A. L. C., to consummate and declare at the earliest possible date the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship.'—Thus matters stand. We are not sufficiently well acquainted with the spirit prevailing in the A. L. C. and with the inner working of that body to account for this sudden *volte-face*, which seems inexplicable in men who accepted the *Brief Statement* and declared their conviction in the *Declaration*. One can understand and to some extent condone impatience at the slow progress in the discussions with Missouri, though here impatience should have been held in check by the consideration that Missouri displayed patience at least equally great. The sudden turn from the extreme right to the extreme left of American Lutheranism strains one's sense of reality and makes heavy demands on the charity that 'believeth all things.' The simultaneous offer of fellowship to both wings approaches a bad joke. After that, we do not think that the proviso in the Mendota resolutions will long stand in the way of consummation of fellowship between the U. L. C. A. and the A. L. C. We look to see the proclamation of fellowship take place 'at the earliest possible date.' For the rest, we accept the judgment of Dr. Wm. Arndt in the January issue (1943) of the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* (Foreword, p. 6): 'If without insistence on such compliance (i. e., with the proviso just spoken of.—H. H.) the A. L. C., listening to the urgings of its liberal wing, will declare pulpit and altar fellowship with the U. L. C. A., conservative Lutheranism will receive a severe blow. Such a move will mean the eventual absorption of the A. L. C. in the U. L. C. A., if not organically, then at least ideologically and theologically. If that should come to pass, we should sincerely regret it. Not only should we consider such a course a violation of divine directives, but we believe that both historically and on account of the convictions of many of its members the A. L. C. does not belong in the liberal camp of Lutherans. We, however, much though we should like to establish fellowship with the A. L. C., could not on that account change our own course and likewise become a liberal Lutheran body, condoning or approving tacitly the membership of many pastors of the U. L. C. A. in the Masonic lodge, the almost indiscriminate pulpit and altar fellowship practiced by many U. L. C. A. churches with sectarian congregations, and the denial of the inerrancy of the Scriptures, which is voiced by prominent U. L. C. A. theologians.'—Should all this come to pass, the United Norwegian Synod and the Augustana Synod would probably also find themselves in fellowship with the U. L. C. A. before long, where indeed one would expect them to feel more at home than the A. L. C.; and American Lutheranism would number two main divisions instead of three. It



would truly be a blow to conservatism in America. Still, we should not despair of the future of Lutheranism in America. When the General Council and the General Synod joined in the 'Merger' twenty-five years ago to form the U. L. C. A., it was done to the slogan: 'Let's merge the best and submerge the rest.' How far that submerging process has been carried out we are unable to say; but it is true that, as Dr. Theodore Graebner has recently pointed out more than once, the U. L. C. A. is today far more Lutheran than was the General Synod one hundred or fifty or forty years ago. One should never do evil that good may come of it. But God's providence does often overrule sin and evil for ultimate good."

—Should readers complain that Dr. Hamann's article contains too much (for them) repetitious historical material, we reply that the historical data, which are here stated in such clear review, are necessary to understand the final verdict of the author, which, we believe, is well worth considering. Besides, are the historical events, here narrated, really so well lodged in our minds that they do not require repetition from time to time and through repetition pertinent re-study of them, especially since they took place so rapidly? Certainly, pulpit and altar fellowship has not yet been officially established between the A. L. C. and the U. L. C. A., and in the A. L. C. and some of its affiliated synods conservative pastors and laymen are still earnestly considering the "obstacles" standing in the way of such fellowship. In the meanwhile, conferences between Missouri Synod and A. L. C. pastors are being held, and numerous helpful books and articles, such as *Toward Lutheran Union* (Graebner-Kretzmann) and the four pertinent articles on the union question in recent issues of the *Lutheran Witness*, are doing much to clarify attitudes and situations and to urge upon all pastors involved in the movement sober Christian thinking and careful, profitable speaking and writing. But even if pulpit and altar fellowship should be declared between the A. L. C. and the U. L. C. A., Dr. Hamann's closing sentences spread a ray of light and hope to such as would see nothing but gloom in that case. At any rate much opportunity is still being given the Synodical Conference to witness to the truth, and Missouri's moderation, patience, and objectivity in dealing in the matter with other synods have done much to gain the good will and confidence of such non-Missouri conservatives as, together with us, desire a church union based on true unity in doctrine and practice. As Dr. Hamann points out, the situation is not so altogether hopeless as some would think. By His grace God may still work the miracle of a Lutheran church union which is in accord with His Word and therefore fully pleasing to Him, if only we continue together in the conscientious study of God's Word. J. T. M.

**The V-12 Program and Chaplaincies.** In the week of July 5 the Navy Department announced the details of the Navy College Training Program for Chaplains. This is part of the Navy's V-12 program. The salient points of this program are the following:

1. "The Navy College Training Program will include a limited number of pre-theological and theological students who will be trained for eventual service in the Navy as chaplains. All denominations and prospective applicants are hereby advised that a man who satisfactorily

completes this program may be appointed a chaplain in the U.S. Naval Reserve, provided he is granted full ordination and ecclesiastical endorsement by his denomination. No applicant will be accepted for this training unless his denomination is prepared to grant full ordination and ecclesiastical endorsement immediately upon the satisfactory completion of this program.

"Applicants who are admitted to this training program will be enlisted or inducted as Apprentice Seamen, U. S. Naval Reserve. They will be placed on active duty and receive the pay, allowances, etc., of Apprentice Seamen. In addition thereto, the Government will provide board, room, tuition, books, and uniforms. While in college they will be given the usual military drills. Theological students in seminaries will not be required to take military drill."

2. All applicants must pass the V-12 screening test and give evidence of potential officer qualifications and scholarship. High school graduates with less than two years of college work are not assigned to the pre-theological program until the end of the first year of college. If not accepted for pre-theological training, such students will continue their college training for some other branch in the service and are not permitted to withdraw from the V-12 program. College juniors and seniors, college graduates, and seminary students, however, may apply directly for admission to the chaplaincy training program, and applicants approved by the Navy for this classification are assured before entering into the service that they will receive pre-theological and theological training.

3. Candidates selected from colleges and universities must attend a school which has adopted the Navy College Program.

4. The time spent for the Bachelor of Arts degree is four academic years of two sixteen-week semesters each. Semesters, however, run consecutively so that the four years' work must be accomplished in three calendar years. The program covering the four years of pre-theological work is as follows: English, 18 hours; History, 22; the Social Studies, 24; Mathematics, 14; the Natural Sciences, 16; Modern Foreign Languages, or Greek, 22; Psychology and Philosophy, 18; and an elective (Bible), 12; Physical Training, 12.

5. For the Bachelor of Divinity degree three academic years of two sixteen-week semesters each are prescribed. The 96 weeks are to be completed in two calendar years. The Navy does not prescribe the curriculum for theological students and "will not exercise any control or jurisdiction over the curriculum of a theological seminary." However, theological students must attend a seminary which in addition to an accelerated program must be near a college training unit, because the theological student "is responsible for military purposes to a commanding officer." Seminary students wear the cadet type uniform with distinguishing insignia instead of the Apprentice Seaman uniform worn by pre-theological students, although retaining the Apprentice Seaman rating.

Any pre-theological or theological student may be dropped from the V-12 program and ordered to general duty in the Navy as an Appren-

ticed Seaman for the following reasons: 1) Disciplinary reasons; 2) failure to maintain set scholarship standards; 3) failure to demonstrate set officerlike qualities; and 4) ecclesiastical endorsement withdrawn by his denomination.

The quota for our Synod would be as follows: three men for the sophomore and junior college years, and two men for each class of the senior college and three classes of the seminary program.

F. E. M.

**Our Theological Curriculum and Navy Chaplaincies.** In reply to a detailed statement concerning the training of ministers in the Missouri Synod, prepared by the undersigned and submitted by the Rev. Paul Dannenfeldt of the Army and Navy Commission, Chaplain Robert D. Workman, Chief of Chaplains, U. S. N., states: "We are all agreed that your course of training for the ministerial students of your denomination is excellent for the purpose for which it is intended. The Navy Department's requirements, however, of those who seek appointment as chaplains in this branch of the armed forces is that each applicant shall have completed four full years of work in an accredited college or university, and three additional years of work in an accredited theological seminary." It is apparent that the Navy's ideals in pre-theological training are different from those of our Church. While we place the major emphasis on such training as will enable men to become strong in exegesis and dogmatics, the Navy is interested primarily in training pre-theological students thoroughly in the social studies, as is evident from the Navy's proposed curriculum for pre-theological training in the V-12 program. In an integrated program such as ours, where the curriculum is fixed beginning with freshman high school, the study of the classical languages can be properly emphasized and progressively intensified during the high school program, so that in reality the four-year high school program in our preparatory schools represents considerably more than the average high school program.—In conferring the A. B. degree on a combined liberal arts and pre-professional program, Concordia Seminary follows the practice of recognized schools in the Middle West. The officials who evaluated our program apparently follow the pattern in vogue among Eastern schools, where the A. B. degree is conferred only upon the completion of four years of strictly liberal arts courses. It is therefore evident that the graduates of Concordia Seminary can meet the requirements of the Navy only if they spend approximately one year in taking additional courses in sociology, economics, psychology, history, and philosophy, and earn their A. B. degree at a school which is accredited with one of the regional accrediting agencies.

F. E. M.

**Wrong View of Ordination.** A correspondence from Edinburgh, published in the *Christian Century*, states that a Czech who had studied theology but whose return to Czechoslovakia for ordination had been made impossible by the war, came to Scotland and joined an air force of his countrymen. "In the absence of any Czech chaplain, he also conducted religious services and, indeed, carried on a religious mission among his fellow countrymen in the air forces." He and others held

the strange view that since he was not ordained, he could not administer the Sacraments. He then applied to the Church of Scotland for ordination "not as a minister of the Church of Scotland, but so that he might act as an ordained chaplain for the men of his own communion." The church authorities held that, strictly speaking, the consent of the Church of Slovakia would have to be procured, but on account of the war it was impossible to get in touch with it. The Assembly of the Church of Scotland then ignored "red tape" and instructed the Edinburgh Presbytery to ordain him "to the office of the Holy Ministry for work among the members of the Church of the Czech Brethren in the Czechoslovakia forces." How sad that such a wrong view is taken of a human ordinance, ordination. The matter should have been settled by a call issued to this Czech candidate of theology by the men whom he served. It is the call that makes a person a minister and not the mere outward act of ordination.

A.

**A New "High" of Papal Claims.** The following editorial appeared in the *Christian Century*:

"Full text of the new papal encyclical *Mysticae Corporis* has not yet been published, but the summary with extended quotations in the Roman Catholic press indicates its scope and purpose. The central part of the encyclical is an 'ample theological study' of the doctrine of the church as the mystical body of Christ. The conclusion is that, since refusal to recognize revealed truth has brought the world to its present unhappy state, the remedy is to be found in the acceptance of the law of God and the authority of Christ. The affirmations and arguments of the encyclical purport to establish the identity of accepting the authority of Christ with accepting the authority of the Roman Catholic Church ('as almost another Christ') and of the Roman pontiff as the infallible bearer of Christ's authority in the world today. In the discussion of the church as the 'mystical body of Christ' there is much that will find a sympathetic response from many Protestant thinkers, though it does not appear in the available extracts from the pope's pronouncement that he makes any valuable contribution to the analysis or exposition of this Pauline concept. His assertion that a 'mystical body' is 'necessarily visible and recognizable . . . imperishable and infallible,' and that Christ 'exercise visible power over the universal church through the Roman pontiff, his vicar on earth,' is merely a reassertion of familiar claims which will be convincing only to those already convinced. Saying it over and over again, in solemn language, with great truths interspersed upon which all Christians must agree, adds nothing to the cogency of the papal claim to be the infallible arbiter under which the church fulfills Christ's commission 'to teach, sanctify, and govern.' The Vatican has learned how to phrase its demand for world-wide dominion in somewhat less provocative terms than those of *Unam Sanctam*, but its demand is unchanged."

No one of our readers will fail to note the words "as almost another Christ" which are employed to describe the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. It appears as though the Pope thinks that his temporal power and his papal claims have to be in inverse ratio.

A.

**A Post-Mortem of Mussolini.** Our readers will peruse with interest what *America*, a Jesuit weekly, has to say on the downfall of Mussolini. Discussing the subject "Mussolini and the Church," the paper says editorially:

"Five years from now historians will be issuing volumes listing all the books, pamphlets, and articles which will explain the fall of Mussolini. We shall learn how his political demise was expected; who it was that betrayed him among his closest friends, or who most effectively planned his destruction among his open enemies.

"The first indications of waning popularity will be remembered, such as the popular resentment at the lavish sums spent by the Regime in order to entertain Hitler on his visit to Rome in 1938; or the gradual diminution of encores on the occasion of his periodical appearances on the balcony of the Palazzo Venezia. Even back in 1939, it was reported, there were but three or four *pro forma* summonses; then the crowd began to dwindle away.

"Less likely to be recalled will be the praises of Mussolini in his early days offered by leading statesmen and contemporary historians in Great Britain and the United States who have had no good word for him in later years.

"When all is appraised and summed up, however, if it ever is, Mussolini's difficulties with the Church will, in all probability, be found to have contributed to his eventual downfall much more than at first sight would be expected. Or, to put this in another way, these difficulties were the sign of an inner weakness which was bound in time to gain the upper hand.

"When Mussolini concluded the Lateran Treaty with the Holy See in 1929, it was the greatest moral triumph of his career. Whatever were his motives in that transaction, it placed him in a position that the greatest diplomats and statesmen of the world could envy. He had cut through a thousand doubts and perplexities; he had restored to the Italian people the noble task of being the earthly custodians, as it were, of the religious leadership of the world.

"But the hour of his moral triumph was followed by the first indications of his future downfall. The bitter controversy concerning Catholic Action which developed from the interpretation of the treaty led to the *Non Abbiamo Bisogno* of Pope Pius XI and exposed the inmost spiritual contradictions of the Fascist system in its relation to education. Mussolini had shocked and grieved the Holy Father beyond measure by his cynical, anti-clerical harangue in the Fascist Parliament. This outburst was a passionate profession of faith in all that the traditional anti-Catholic or anti-religious elements in Italy had brewed through the years against the Church and against the Holy See; all that had vexed the Church and contributed toward its persecution.

"Once more, on February 11, 1932, Mussolini's ceremonial visit to the Vatican seemed to be a harbinger of a brighter future. But the seed of estrangement had been too deeply planted not to keep on fructifying. Regardless of his personal beliefs or lack of beliefs, Mussolini had maintained a certain link with the Church by his far-reach-



ing plans for social reform, such as his ringing attack on "industrial urbanism" in his historic speech of May 26, 1927. But these were eventually subordinated to his still further-reaching schemes of world empire. It was only a matter of time when the door would be opened for the greatest of all estrangements, the admission of Hitler's militantly pagan ideology to an honored place in Fascist Italy. There was no longer a question of a squint: an eye to a brutal pragmatism, yet still with an eye to the practical importance of religion and of certain spiritual ideas and spiritually inspired social policies. The squint was succeeded by a glare, and that glare was fixed upon objects and aims prescribed by an alien and a master hand.

"The Duce's increasing distance from the Church had the fatal effect of isolating him from his own people, who have remained fundamentally Catholic, as their unswerving devotion in wartime to the Holy Father has proved. At the same time, it built up a wall of spiritual isolation between Italy and the rest of the world." We are not surprised to see this attempt of the Jesuits to make capital out of Mussolini's inglorious exit.

A.

**Self-Communion by the Pastor.**—*The Australasian Theological Review* is so delightfully readable, especially in its editorial features *Notes and Comments* and *The Church in the World*, written by the Rev. Prof. H. Hamann, D.D., president of Concordia College, Unley, South Australia, that we heartily recommend it to our pastors who are interested in worth-while theological literature. We are sure they will not regret the small investment which brings them such rich returns. The periodical may be ordered through Concordia Publishing House.—Our brethren in Australia, facing the problem of more frequent communing by pastors living in isolated localities, some time ago considered the question of self-communion by the pastor and published in their official quarterly (March 31, 1943) a conclusive report on the matter adopted by the South Australian District Pastoral Conference. In introducing the report, Dr. Hamann remarks that all that can be said on the matter has already been stated by Dr. Walther in his *Pastoraltheologie* (pp.197—200; also 175—181), so that there really is no need of further comment. He subjoins also Dr. Pieper's classroom remark: "*Die Gemeinde mag ein Gemeindeglied, etwa einen Vorsteher, dazu bestimmen, dem Pastor das Abendmahl zu reichen.*" Nevertheless, because of its clearness, precision, and completeness the "report" is well worth considering. Professor Hamann writes: "1. There is nothing in Holy Scripture to prevent the pastor from communing with his congregation; on the contrary, it is most reasonable to assume that the 'elders' and 'bishops' in apostolic times joined in Holy Communion with their flock. 2. The greatest theologians of the Lutheran Church, from Luther down, have declared self-communion by the pastor to be permissible in case of necessity; i.e., when the pastor's isolated situation deprives him of the blessings of the Holy Communion except at long intervals. 3. There seems to be a desire in our circles for more frequent Communion on the part of the pastor than on the few occasions provided by pastoral conferences and synodical meetings. There are many good reasons why this should be recom-

mended, and there is no sound reason why it should be discouraged. 4. Another way of meeting the difficulty is to let the congregation appoint one of its members (one of the deacons, or elders) to administer the sacred elements to the pastor. This method must certainly be left open [be permitted] if pastor and congregation prefer it. 5. If, as a result of a favorable vote by the conference, self-communion of the pastor is introduced in our congregations, it is perhaps desirable that some degree of uniformity be aimed at. Two ways suggest themselves: a. that the pastor takes the bread and wine *before* he dispenses them to the congregation; b. that he takes the elements *after* all other communicants have received them. In both cases no dispensing words need be used, but the pastor may well add the prayer: 'May the body of the Lord Jesus Christ, and His precious blood, strengthen and keep me in true faith to life everlasting. Amen.' Perhaps the second way is to be preferred, because it corresponds more closely to the method now in use when two pastors officiate. 6. In congregations where self-communion or reception of the Sacrament at the hands of an elder has not so far been practiced, the pastor must, of course, discuss the matter with the congregation and give the necessary instruction before the innovation is introduced."

In view of the facts that Holy Communion has the nature of an absolution and that the Office of the Keys and its administration belongs primarily to Christian believers as spiritual priests, Dr. Pieper's *anderer Ausweg* may be preferred to self-communion by the pastor. If, in that case, the pastor receives the Lord's Supper at the hands of a chosen elder or deacon, it is made clear also that he receives it not as a pastor, but as one of the believing members of the congregation. There may be no danger of a *Priesterstolz*, or priestly pride, in our democratic circles, but it is nevertheless well for the pastor, when he receives the Holy Supper, to show also by outward form that he receives it just as do all other believers. Of course, the whole matter belongs into the field of *adiaphora*, which, nevertheless, are governed by the royal rule of Christian conduct that "all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. 14:40. See also Smalcald Articles, *Conc. Trigl.*, 465, § 4; C. T. M., XI:610 ff.

J. T. M.

**Unscriptural Teaching at Colgate-Rochester.**—Under this heading, Ernest Gordon, in the *Sunday School Times* (May 22, 1943), furnishes proof that Rochester Theological Seminary, now known as Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, is no longer the conservative Baptist Seminary it used to be when Dr. Augustus H. Strong taught there as professor of Christian dogmatics. One of its present teachers is Prof. Conrad Moehlman, who in 1939 published a book called *Protestantism's Challenge: a Study of the Survival Value of Protestantism*. The excerpts from Professor Moehlman's book which Dr. Gordon offers show that Colgate-Rochester's Protestantism has very few survival values left. Here are some of Professor Moehlman's untrue and unchristian pronouncements: "The seven words of the cross are not historically dependable. Did Jerusalem Jews nineteen centuries ago cry: 'His blood be upon us and our children'? Did they publicly choose Caesar as king? The answer of history is, No!" (P. 190.) Again: "John 19:16:

"We have no king but Caesar!" On the face of it this is slander contradicted by the whole history of Israel and Judah." (P.205.) Again: "Does Jesus anywhere suggest that an atonement must be offered before God can forgive? For Jesus forgiveness is on the basis of repentance and faith." (P.227.) Has Professor Moehlman never read Matt. 20:28? Or: "Jesus seems unacquainted with man corrupted by an ancient fall. Man is not at all helpless. The human mind is a trustworthy guide. It can be depended on to give us dependable information regarding God. Man can do the will of God. Jesus' view of the splendor of man beckons him to scale the ethical heights of life and is antithetical to the postulates of most Christian churches." (P.238.) But what about John 3:5,6? Or: "Invention is resorted to for the purpose of insuring the agreement of the passion of Jesus with what is assumed to be its prediction [i. e., Is. 53, for example. — E. G.]." (P.208.) But what about the blatant inventions of Modernists to deny the divine truths so clearly taught in Scripture? Again: "The Gospel of John offers a second-century construction of what took place at Calvary." (P.215.) But even that certainly would be safer than Professor Moehlman's own twentieth-century construction, which simply denies what the four evangelists declare with one accord. Again: "There was no trial of Jesus by the Jewish Sanhedrin. It was Pilate who sent Jesus to the cross as a political revolutionist. Jesus did not die as a religious prophet, but upon the charge of revolution." (P.208.) Professor Moehlman seems to feel himself quite omniscient in deciding what is fact in sacred history and what is not. Or: "This earliest fellowship meal [the Lord's Supper] was not related to the death of Jesus in any expiatory way." (P.164.) "The Christian Eucharist is not rooted in the Jewish Passover." (P.160.) But why add any more Modernistic *no's* to the *yea's* and *amen's* of Holy Scripture? We agree with Dr. Gordon when he writes: "A seminary that countenances such teaching is not worthy of Christian confidence and support. Protestantism of this type has no survival value."

J. T. M.

**Missions as Seen by Modernists.** — *The Presbyterian Guardian* (May, 1943) very interestingly reviews a little book of ninety-six pages, entitled *Christian World Facts* (1942), published "for the use of ministers and lay readers" by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. This booklet, it is said, contains items of information concerning missionary work all over the world, as well as short articles on missions by various persons. The Modernist slant in it is unmistakable both in what is included and in what is omitted. The little book may interest us, because the Foreign Missions Conference of North America represents the Foreign Mission Boards of most of the large and some of the small denominations of American Protestantism. It is one of the eight bodies involved in the recent Cleveland meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and is one of the important organizations that will comprise the projected North American Council of Churches. That means that the Conference is a body of utmost importance in giving out information and deciding issues on missionary work. Now, as the *Presbyterian Guardian* asks, Is it trustworthy in its functions of reporting and interpreting the situation on the foreign mission fields to ministers

and church members at home? The *Guardian* is not very greatly pleased with the page of Spanish-American poetry, which opens with a poem called "Deity." The poem is by Amad Nervo, who died in 1910. "But why," asks the *Guardian*, "should it be selected for a place in such a publication as *Christian World Facts*? The pantheizing trend of the first stanza [which the *Guardian* quotes] is obvious. So it asks: "Is the Christianity sponsored by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America inclusive enough to take in pantheism?" Again, the *Guardian* is not at all pleased with the way the book quotes such Modernists as Toyohiko Kagawa and Albert Schweitzer, giving not the slightest hint that these men have departed far from the historic Christian truth. "The uninformed reader would naturally tend to conclude that Kagawa and Schweitzer are Christian believers in the old-fashioned meaning of the word." Lastly, the book, while mentioning the attitude of the Japanese government toward Christianity, creates the totally false impression that the Japanese authorities are favorable or at least fair to true Christianity. After having proved its point, the *Guardian* writes: "If it is true that there has been little or no interference on the part of the Japanese government with Christian institutions in Japan, this is only because of the spineless spirit of compromise with which the churches in Japan, and foreign missionaries along with them, have met every demand on the part of the government. This spirit of compromise prevailed for many months before attack was made upon Britain and America, and there is no evidence of a change since then." The *Guardian* concludes its review with the remarks: "Since a publication such as *Christian World Facts* has nothing whatever to say against the abominable idolatry of Japanese State Shinto and the Christ-dishonoring Religious Bodies Law of Japan, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the paganism of American Modernism is quite compatible with the paganism of Japanese supernaturalism. If *Christian World Facts* represents the real character of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, we cannot avoid the conclusion that that body is neither true to the orthodox Christian faith nor trustworthy in reporting and interpreting conditions on the mission fields to the churches at home." Much has been said recently of the revival of Christian orthodoxy during the last few years, and there may be some truth in it so far as certain religious areas are concerned. But as our reading of late has shown, the backward-leaning, dyed-in-the-wool liberals are fighting a hard battle to hold their battered fortress of infidelity. Christian defenders of the faith have no right at all to think that there is nothing to fear since divine truth finds universal acceptance. Such conditions simply do not prevail during the last period of the world's existence. Our age calls for indoctrinated teachers and bold defenders of the precious truth which is in Christ Jesus.

J. T. M.

**How Does God Speak to Men?** This question Dr. Harris Franklin Rall, prominent Modernist in our country, answers in his department "Dr. Rall Answers Questions on Beliefs" in the *Christian Advocate* (Aug. 12, 1943). When dealing with laymen in popular church periodicals, Modernists dare not indulge in their usual nebulous obscurities, concealing their

ideas (if really they have any) rather than revealing them; but they must speak in terms which laymen can fairly comprehend. The "eighty-five-year-young correspondent" who put the question, insisted that God could not reveal Himself merely by deeds (a common liberal claim), but needed words, too, to make Himself known to men. The reply which is given shows that what Rall teaches is both antichristian and antiscritptural. Rall contends in his reply that "God's revelation of Himself comes first in action. It is not by words supernaturally dropped from heaven or dictated to the writers of psalm or prophetic sermon, of gospel or epistle" (a denial of Biblical inspiration). He then states that God reveals Himself (which, of course, is right) in nature and history, adding to this the "illumination by His Spirit which enabled them [the Old Testament prophets] to know what was His character, His truth, and His will for men." Rall thus substitutes illumination for inspiration, as modern rationalistic theology has done long ago. Lastly he says: "The supreme deed of God and His supreme Word to man is Christ Himself. He is the Word." But how is this to be understood? Rall continues: "When Paul wrote his letters, which give us our best statement of the Christian gospel, the Spirit of the saving and revealing God was present to help him in insight and expression. This was all a part of God's work, only we must not think of that work in a mechanical fashion as a dictation of words or a laying down of ideas. In these words of evangelist and apostle they sought to set down God's Word to them. As we read their words, God is once more present with His Spirit, and through their words He speaks to us. Here again we have the deed of the living God." This sounds quite orthodox, as indeed of late Modernists invariably give to their unbelief a tinge of orthodoxy. According to what he here says, Rall may even be said to teach the Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace, i. e., the doctrine of the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost with and through the words of the evangelists and apostles. But Rall by no means thinks of God's self-revealing process in terms of traditional orthodoxy. He closes his reply with the words: "*But we must remember that the Word by which God speaks to us is one thing, the particular words are another*" (italics our own). "God's Word comes to us through the Bible, but the Bible is not composed of the words of God" (italics our own). Here again is Rall's fight against, and open rejection of, Biblical inspiration. According to Rall, the Bible neither is the Word of God nor contains the Word of God. It is only the means by which through the Spirit the Word of God comes to us, and this is typically Reformed doctrine (Schwaermerei). Rall says: "At their best, words are human affairs, symbols and signs of something that can be indicated by this speech of man, but never defined or wholly encompassed. God is always more than finite mind can grasp or human speech set forth." This indeed is true; nevertheless, as our Lutheran dogmatists declare, what God reveals of Himself and His works in our simple, imperfect, "prattling" (Luther) *modo concipiendi*, is the divine truth (John 17:17), which we now see through a glass darkly, but then face to face (1 Cor. 13:12). What Rall declares is not at all an argument against Biblical inspiration, but merely a stra-



tegic, "false prophet" move to draw the reader's attention away from the real issue at stake. Rall closes his reply with the words: "It is enough that through these words [those of the evangelists and apostles. But why not of the prophets?] we are brought face to face with God and hear His summons, and that when we hear and follow, we know Him in a life of saving fellowship." Rall's reply falls under the condemnation of Luther's words in the Smalcald Articles: "All this is the old devil and old serpent, who also converted Adam and Eve into enthusiasts and led them from the outward Word of God to spiritualizing and self-conceit, and nevertheless he accomplished this through other outward words. Just as also our enthusiasts condemn the outward Word, and nevertheless they fill the world with their pratings and writings, as though, indeed, the Spirit could not come through the writings and spoken Word of the apostles, but through their writings and words He must come." And just before this, Luther says: "And in those things which concern the spoken, outward Word, we must firmly hold that God grants His Spirit or grace to no one except through or with the preceding outward Word, in order that we may be protected against the enthusiasts" (*Triglot*, p. 495). We have quoted Rall's words chiefly because there prevails today the erroneous impression that Modernists have swung back toward Christian orthodoxy by way of Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr, whose influence upon them has indeed been pronounced. But this "orthodoxy" is only in word, not in deed, as the recent book *Liberal Theology. An Appraisal* (Scribner's 1942), which deserves study by all who are interested in modern non-Christian theological trends, proves. We welcome, of course, the fact that liberal attacks upon Christian truth just now are less ferocious than they used to be some time ago, but antagonism against the divine truth is often more dangerous in its subtle than in its brutal form. Non-Christian theology today stands about where Schleiermacher stood a little over a century ago. Barthianism somewhat shifted the controversy, but has not brought liberal theology closer to Christian conservatism. This is true also of Reinhold Niebuhr's theology, which, despite many expressions to the contrary, has not gone back to the basic Christian conceptions of the Law and the Gospel. Niebuhr is not any more orthodox than is Professor C. H. Dodd of Cambridge, whose influence upon the young generation of liberal theologians is indeed great. As *Time* (Aug. 23, 1943) reports, Niebuhr recently received the degree of D.D. from Oxford University, which thus recognized him as an outstanding religious teacher, and, of course, as one quite in accordance with Oxford Liberalism. Speaking of this, *Time* appends also a rather scurrilous, blasphemous Oxford witticism (a proof of the levity prevailing among Liberals): "Thou shalt love the Lord thy Dodd with all thy heart and thy Niebuhr as thyself." As much as one may detest such blasphemy, there nevertheless lies in it some truth. Liberal Niebuhr may be mentioned with liberal Dodd in the same breath, just as Luther used to mention in the same breath Mohammed and the Pope, accusing them both and in equal measure of antichristian heresy. Dodd, of course, too, has of late gone back to orthodox terminology in speaking of God and divine things.

J. T. M.

**Brief Items.** A book has appeared (*Celestial Homespun* by Katherine Burton) in which the biography of Isaac Hecker, the founder of the Paulist Fathers, is presented. As the review of the book in *America* points out, his parents, strange to say, were Protestants. The Paulist Fathers are a prominent missionary order of the Roman Catholic Church.

"Now what we apprehended has come to pass. That which in our plans we foresaw is a very sad reality, for one of the most famous basilicas, that of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, is now in very great part destroyed." Thus wrote Pope Pius XII to a cardinal after the bombing of Rome.

A remarkable election is reported in the London Letter of the *Christian Century*. Dr. Harold Moody, "a West Indian of African descent," was elected to become the chairman of the London Missionary Society and has now entered upon his office. He is a medical man and has his practice in London.

In Paris a prominent Protestant leader has died, Wilfred Monnot, who was especially interested in the Christian Student Movement in France. He was instrumental in bringing about a reunion of the two factions of the French Reformed Church.

"It used to be doubted whether a man's personality could make itself felt over the radio. All such doubts have long since vanished." These words which we read in an exchange may well lead us to ponder the power of the radio today.

The preacher's sense of fair play should restrain him from using his pulpit as a platform for political harangue or as a soap box for presenting economic panaceas. Such questions can be handled fairly only in forums of free discussion.—Ralph W. Sockman quoted in the *Christian Century*.  
A.

---

## Book Review

---

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

**A Man in Christ.** The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion. By James S. Stewart, M.A., B.D. Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York and London. 332 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$2.00.

We do not hesitate to call this an important book, because it submits a thorough examination of the chief concepts in Paul's epistles and endeavors to reach proper, tenable conclusions concerning them in the light of modern research. One is here introduced to the most prominent New Testament scholars of the present time; hence, whoever thoroughly studies this book is made well acquainted with what modern thinkers offer on the subject of Paul's religion. We might call this a parallel volume to Machen's great work *The Origin of Paul's Religion*. Machen's book is more historical, not stressing the doctrinal contents of Paul's letters as much as Stewart does. But Machen, we must add, clings to the inerrancy of the Scriptures, while Stewart does not hesitate to admit the occurrence of inaccuracies and blunders; for instance, he says (p. 42): "Here and there, it is true, the rabbinic technique betrays Paul into statements and sentiments which are open to serious challenge." The book has six chapters, having the headings: Paul or Paulinism? — Heritage and Environment — Disillusionment and Discovery — Mysticism and Morality — Reconciliation and Justification — Historic Jesus and Exalted Christ. A glance at these captions shows that the author strives to discuss what is most prominent in Paul's teachings. He approaches Paul with sympathy and enthusiasm. That he has reached some remarkable insights becomes apparent from a paragraph like the following (p. 17): "The first requisite [for the interpreter of Paul] is that spiritual sympathy of experience. That is why Luther stands out as a supreme interpreter of Paul: the men were blood-brothers in Christ." The book abounds in beautiful passages. Witness these words of Paul's teaching concerning the nature of faith (p. 180f.): "As for the estimate of faith as a meritorious human achievement, any such idea is shattered once for all by Paul's great central declaration that God, and God only, is the Author of salvation. The very faith which is the upward reach of man's soul comes from without and is a gift of God. And if it be asked, how that can be so, Paul's answer is that God, by revealing Himself in Christ, and in the life and death and resurrection of Christ, has shown Himself to be utterly worthy of all trust and devotion — which is equivalent to saying that God Himself is the Creator and Giver of faith. The human heart does not produce it: God bestows it. No man can be convinced of the Gospel facts in a saving way apart from the prior action of God upon his soul." One gladly quotes, too, what he has to say on Paul's teaching concerning election or predestination (p. 143ff.): "Predestination, in this aspect, is just another name for grace. It is safe to say that if Paul's interpreters had always kept this personal background adequately in view, many of the enormities of interpretation which have

overshadowed the whole idea of election, making it productive of misgiving and even of misery for thousands of pious souls, could never have been perpetrated. What Paul is really trying to do is not to suggest misgivings, but to remove them. He is bidding anxious souls reflect that their religion stands in the last resort not upon their choice of Christ, but upon Christ's choice of them. What a note of ringing confidence, he seems to say, that fact ought to impart to your personal religion!"

It is impossible in this review to state our reaction to the views the author expresses on other controversial points. We, of course, cannot agree with him when he looks upon Rom. 7:14-25 as describing Paul's state *before* his conversion (p. 99ff.). Nor do we believe that in the section on Reconciliation and Justification (where he, by the way, speaks of the forensic character of justification as preached by Paul) is doing justice to what Paul says of the "wrath of God" (p. 217ff.). The above has to suffice. It is impossible for us to enter upon further details. We trust that enough has been said to convince the reader that here we are dealing with a valuable book on the great Apostle of the Gentiles which deserves our serious study. The fact that the author is pastor of a congregation and not a teacher at a theological school has probably helped to make his presentation simple and direct. W. ARNDT

**The Meaning of Repentance.** By William Douglas Chamberlain, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. 238 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$2.00.

This study of the weighty, all-important word *μετάνοια* is valuable in that it conclusively shows that the word means a complete change of mind, a radical *Sinnesaenderung*. The reader will profit by the author's thorough examination and fine presentation of this phase of the meaning of repentance. But it loses its value in that it presents the Reformed definition of repentance as an "evangelical grace." It has entirely lost sight of the truth that this absolutely necessary, this saving change of mind in the sinner consists in no longer trusting in his own righteousness, but trusting in the righteousness of Jesus. That is the Lutheran meaning of repentance. "Repentance consists properly of these two parts: One is contrition, that is, terrors smiting the conscience through the knowledge of sin; the other is faith, which is born of the Gospel, or of absolution, and believes that, for Christ's sake, sins are forgiven, comforts the conscience, and delivers it from terrors. Then good works are bound to follow, which are the fruits of repentance." (*Augs. Conf.*, XII.) Reformed theology makes these "fruits of repentance" the essential part of repentance. "Repentance unto life is an evangelical grace. By it a sinner . . . so grieves and hates his sins as to turn from them all unto God, purposing and endeavoring to walk with him in all the ways of his commandments." (*Westminster Confession*, XV.) It will be seen at once that it is a grave error to make repentance, by which we obtain salvation, to consist essentially in an ethical change of the mind and heart. And that is the meaning which our author gives the word repentance. He says: "Calvin is in line with Paul when he says that repentance follows faith and is produced by it."

(P. 171.) "Faith produces repentance." (P. 168.) Statements like these form the gist of the book: "Dethroning self and taking up one's cross are two ways of saying the same thing. This is the basic fact of repentance." (P. 144.) "Repentance is a pilgrimage from the mind of the flesh to the mind of Christ." (P. 47.) "Repentance is moving from the mind of the flesh to the mind of Christ." (P. 222.) The author does not think of denying that salvation is by faith alone. He asserts that repeatedly. But what a hopeless confusion ensues when he, for instance, quotes Luke 24:46f., speaks of "'repentance' and the consequent removal of sin" (p. 60), and then defines repentance as ceasing from sin and leading a holy life!

Our author is out of line with the Calvinistic theology when he declares that "the will of man plays a decisive part in repentance": "Man is not entirely passive in this transformation. This assumption that the human will plays an important part in reversing one's course of life and thought is also in line with the Old Testament usage of the verb *שׁוּב*, 'turn ye.'" (Pp. 175, 184.)

Here are some valuable gleanings from the book: "The eighteenth century thought of itself as the age of Reason, the last half of the nineteenth as the age of Reasonableness. The present is coming near to being the age of Unreason." (Canon Streeter. P. 195.) — "The theology of the nineteenth century found it necessary to 'think away' (A. Harnack) whatever conflicted with its theological presuppositions. When we start 'thinking away' the deity of Christ, as Harnack and others did, we end by 'thinking away' His authority." (P. 200.) — "Make me a captive, Lord, And then I shall be free; Force me to render up my sword, And I shall conqueror be." (G. Matheson. P. 144.) — "We have imported our ideas of mass production into the Church; we measure all things by statistics. But the spiritual quality of our members is far more important than the number on our Church rolls." (P. 199.) — "Throughout Christian history all great preaching has been strongly doctrinal. For instance, the Reformation preachers established for Protestantism the doctrine of justification by faith. Every great forward movement in the Church has been accompanied, if not brought about, by great preaching." (P. 204.)

TH. ENGELDER

**Toward Lutheran Union.** By Theodore Graebner, D.D., and Paul E. Kretzmann, Ph.D., D.D., Ed.D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis. 240 pages, 7½×5. Leatherette paper cover, \$1.00; cloth, \$1.50.

The authors of this book are not presenting the present status of the union movement of the Lutheran churches of our country, but they are restating the Scriptural principles which must be observed in any movement toward doctrinal unity. In the introduction they say: "The book was written with the intention of making it objective. It is not in any way intended as a criticism of current expressions in the matter of Lutheran union, its purpose being simply to supply the reader, presumably an earnest and honest searcher for the truth, with the material which will enable him to form his own judgments." (P. VII.) A few quotations will acquaint the reader with the tenor of the book: "Accord-



ing to Scripture this unity presupposes one thing, a feature which is absolutely essential to the establishment and maintenance of a God-pleasing oneness of spirit, and that is the full agreement as to the inspiration, the infallibility, and the inviolability of the Holy Scriptures. As we shall see, we are compelled by Holy Writ itself to make this a *conditio sine qua non* in all negotiations tending toward church fellowship of every kind and degree." (P. 2.) "None of the fathers, least of all Dr. Walther, ever declared non-fundamental doctrines non-essential." (P. 57.) "Every true Christian must take this position: A persistent denial of any doctrine, fundamental or non-fundamental, primary or secondary, yea, of any statement of the Bible, will militate against the doctrine of inspiration and thus undermine the very foundation of Christian belief. In other words: No person has the liberty to say: This teaching is indeed *found* in the Bible, or it is *based upon* clear statements of the Bible, but I still will not believe it; for by such attitude he would overthrow the authority of the Scripture, that is, the organic foundation." (P. 119.)

The following chapter heads are treated: I. Laying the Foundation; II. Some Dialectical Premises; III. The Limitations of Reason in Apprehending the Truths of Scripture; IV. The Rightful Place of Controversy in Church Life; V. The Church, Unity, and Fellowship; VI. What About Doctrinal Aberrations? VII. Unionism; VIII. The Universal Priesthood of Believers; IX. Pulpit and Altar Fellowship; X. Prayer Fellowship; XI. Is There a Unionism in Private Conduct? XII. Co-operation in Externals.

While this book is primarily intended to be read and studied by the pastor and theologian, the layman can also read it with profit. At a time when the religious atmosphere is heavily charged with spiritual indifference, and the church bodies surrounding our Lutheran churches are attempting at any cost to unite all denominations into a universal Church, it is very necessary that both pastor and layman be fortified in the position which our Lutheran Church has always held in regard to doctrinal unity. While we much desire that the Lutheran church bodies of our country should be united, we are not minded to have this done at the expense of the truth. From Scripture and from history we learn that God finally takes His Word away from those who fail to appreciate it.

J. H. C. FRITZ

**Grace for Grace. 1853—1943. 1918—1943.** By Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker and Pastors C. Anderson and G. Lillegard. Lutheran Synod Book Co., Mankato, Minn. 211 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.25.

The reviewer confesses that the reading of this most absorbing "History of the Norwegian Synod" in our country has filled him with the greatest delight and that, if this were possible, he would like to see a copy in every pastor's library and all the many school and Sunday school libraries of our Church to be read by young and old alike. The book tells the inspiring story of how a few believing, earnest, bold, and confessional Lutheran Norwegians banded themselves together to form a truly Lutheran synod, how this synod became a light and a salt to thousands of other Lutherans in our land, and how when in 1918 there

occurred the well-known unfortunate break, a very small band again stood firm as a rock for what it regarded as right and true and honorable, no matter what sufferings they had to endure for their confession in word and deed. There have been ninety years of rich blessings for the Norwegian Synod before the split came, and now again twenty-five years of rich spiritual blessings since the "Little Norwegian Church" dared to stand alone. The book is divided into three parts: one, introductory, by Dr. Ylvisaker, showing the foundation on which his synod stands against all errorists, a second by Pastor C. Anderson, outlining in thirteen chapters the history of the beginnings, growth, and development of the Norwegian Synod, and a third by Pastor G. Lillegard, tracing the doctrinal controversies of the Norwegian Synod in seven chapters. A number of fine illustrations adorn the book, among these the "Oaks of Koshkonong," famous as the first gathering place of the faithful Norwegians, and pictures of President Herman Amberg Preus, Pastor Jakob Aall Ottesen, and of President Ulrik Vilhelm "Stonewall" Koren. There is a marked contrast between the "First Luther College" at Half-way Creek and the present beautiful Bethany Lutheran College of the stalwart synod. It is good to be with Norwegians when they love the word of God, and it does one good to read of their heroism in confessing their Savior to the last bitter end. The book is interesting and inspiring wherever one may read it, but the part on the doctrinal controversies offers the reader a liberal education in theology which entitles it to a place in every Lutheran library, lay and clerical. May the book enjoy a wide circulation, and may it accomplish what it should accomplish—greater loyalty to the Word of Truth in a time when that loyalty is so greatly needed.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

**Case Work in Preaching.** By Ezra Rhoades. Fleming H. Revell Co. 159 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.25.

Strange as it may seem, we begin our discussion of this book with the remark that the questions appended to the twelve sections alone are worth the price of the book. For it means to the preacher about what Davis' *Self-Improvement for Teachers* meant, about a dozen years ago. Here are a few sample questions: "Do I approach my pulpit with a shining face? Do I expect by pessimism to develop optimism? Do I try to keep up with Biblical scholarship? Do I make my sermons seasonable? Do I make undue use of pathos? Do my illustrations appear to be dragged in? Do I give the Bible a fair chance for intellectual stimulation and spiritual exhilaration?" One is tempted to quote more, but these samples will suffice. The various sections or chapters each offer a definite challenge. They treat the following topics, as we have labeled them for our own use: The Need of Self-criticism; The Cheerfulness of the Gospel Message; Progress Based on Hard Work; The Attempt to Overawe; Making the Message Fit; Study Teaching Situations; Using Illustrations; The Deadly Rut; Delivering the Message; Watching the Voice; Guarding Against Despondency; Personal Confidence. We are tempted to quote copiously from the book, but perhaps it will be best to close by saying: It is not a book on homiletics such as we have been accustomed to, but it is certainly worth the price to any preacher who wants to make his sermons worth while.

P. E. KRETZMANN

**Twentieth Century Philosophy.** Edited by Dagobert D. Runes. Philosophical Library, New York. 571 pages, 6×9. Price, \$5.00.

The purpose of this book is to present to the student of contemporary thought an overview of present-day philosophical trends by means of carefully chosen and elaborated essays which are broad enough to cover pretty well the entire field of modern philosophical investigation. Some of the articles are reprints, as, for example, Roscoe Pound's "Philosophy of Law," A.N. Whitehead's "Philosophy of Life," Bertrand Russell's "Philosophy of the Twentieth Century," George Santayana's "Transcendental Absolutism," John Dewey's "Development of American Pragmatism," and others. To mention these titles and authors means to suggest to the reader how much in valuable study and thought the book has to offer him. Other titles read: "Ethics," "Aesthetics," "Axiology" (the general theory of value), "Theology and Metaphysics," "Kantianism," "The Humanism of St. Thomas Aquinas," "Personalism," "Dialectical Materialism," "Philosophic Naturalism," "Philosophies of China," and so forth. The articles require careful and attentive reading, but in most cases the approach is lucid and the presentation readily intelligible. Not every minister can do extensive reading in ancient and modern philosophy. But there is perhaps no minister today who can afford to remain ignorant of what modern philosophy has to say and where it stands. Its influence, at any rate, upon literature in every form is tremendous. We therefore recommend this book for general study to all who are interested in the subject. Lack of space prevents us from discussing in detail the various philosophical movements presented in it, but we are sure that the reader will deeply appreciate the wealth of speculative learning stored up in the twenty-two essays that make up this timely and instructive book.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

*From Central Bible, Book, and Tract Depot, Detroit, Mich.:*

**Isms, Adventism, Christian Science, Russellism, Spiritualism, Unity, Mormonism.** By W. T. McLean. 40 pages, 4½×7½.

*From Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.:*

**In the Sanctuary.** Expository Sermons on the Lord's Prayer. By Rev. Herman Hoeksema. 120 pages. Price, \$1.00.

#### To Our Subscribers

It has been our custom to retain the names of our subscribers on our lists for two numbers after the subscription has expired, so that the subscriptions could be continued without interruption in case a renewal came in late. We were very happy to follow this plan at extra expense, but we are now unable to continue this policy because of present conditions.

Our Government has insisted that we reduce consumption of paper and eliminate all possible waste. Because of the restriction in the use of paper it will become necessary to discontinue subscriptions for all of our periodicals with the last number paid for under the subscription agreement. We shall, however, continue our policy of reminding our subscribers of the expiration of the subscription by inserting the usual number of notices in the second last and the last numbers of the periodicals they receive. It is our sincere hope that our subscribers will co-operate with us and the Government by renewing their subscriptions promptly upon receipt of the first notice.

June, 1943

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE